



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2020

No. 205

## Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, December 7, 2020, at 3 p.m.

## House of Representatives

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2020

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:  
Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

At the end of the week, we use this moment to be reminded of Your presence, and to tap the resources needed by the Members of this people's House to do their work as well as it can be done in the days remaining in the 116th Congress.

May they be led by Your spirit in the decisions they make. May they possess Your power as they steady themselves amid the pressures of persistent problems.

May their faith in You deliver them from tensions that make fruitful legislative work difficult, and from worries that might wear them out.

In the final days of this Congress, may they do their best to find solutions to pressing issues facing our Nation during these stressful times of coronavirus.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 4(a) of House Resolution 967, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PHILLIPS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### WE MUST RISE TO THE OCCASION

(Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, the foundation of America's greatness stems from its remarkable ability—our remarkable ability—to meet the moment during times of crisis.

Whether our foremothers and forefathers faced threats from overseas, economic depressions, natural disasters, or attacks on our own soil, they rose to the occasion. They met the moment, and history shined favorably upon their legacies.

And now it is our turn.

The pandemic is an enemy that has already killed 276,000 of our neighbors across the Nation, and by the time it is over, it will have likely claimed more lives—American lives—than World War II.

Families are hungry, restaurants and businesses are closing, millions are unemployed, and each one of them is waiting on us.

But common ground has been found, my friends. A bipartisan, bicameral framework awaits our action. Time is short, the need is great, and I implore that we all come together and get it done.

### COMMENDING THE CENTRAL TEXAS FOOD BANK

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the Central Texas Food Bank for being a leader in the fight against hunger and for their commitment to serving our community over the last 40 years.

Their generosity and dedication to our Texas neighbors is at the heart of the American story. Last year alone, they provided 39 million meals to central Texas families, including those in Burnet, Coryell, Bell, Lampasas, Hays, and Travis Counties in the 25th District.

I was grateful for the opportunity this fall to join them distributing food to veterans and their families in the Austin area, and I look forward to working together in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all the volunteers who are working around the clock to provide food for families during a time that has presented unique and unforeseen challenges, especially as we celebrate this holiday season. By

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6817

mobilizing our communities to serve and inspiring younger generations to give back where they can, they are making us a stronger and a better nation.

May God bless all of them, may God bless Texas, and may He continue to bless the greatest country on Earth, the United States of America.

In God We Trust.

#### COVID-19 AID PACKAGE

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, look, we all know this pandemic is not over—it is far from over—and Congress has to do its job. Families, seniors, small businesses are suffering, and they need Congress to act now before we leave town.

When we were all home over the Thanksgiving holiday, we all saw the same thing: the heartbreaking images of people, people who never have had to seek help, standing in lines for food, millions of people out of work.

Small businesses, well, they are closing. We are losing small businesses every single day, and now Federal unemployment benefits are set to expire.

Look, families are falling into poverty as a result of our inaction.

The people who are hurting are represented by Democrats and Republicans. The people who are hurting are in every district across this country.

We worked to get to a solution. In this House, we passed, twice, legislation that would provide that relief, but, at this moment, we need to come together as Democrats and Republicans.

The people who are hurting are represented by Democrats and Republicans. The solution has to come in a bipartisan form. So let's set aside our differences. Let's find common ground. Let's pass a COVID relief bill now.

#### LET'S EXTEND THE PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending the successful and bipartisan Paycheck Protection Program by making \$138 billion in already appropriated funds available to help more businesses that are experiencing dire and desperate need.

This week, it was reported that almost 30 percent of small businesses in New York have closed for good due to the COVID-19 epidemic, and many more will face the same fate without further aid.

\$138 billion appropriated to the PPP is just sitting here in Washington, D.C., instead of helping our Nation's small businesses.

For months, we have asked the Speaker to allow a vote on H.R. 8265, which simply enables the SBA to do

another round of grant awards, getting this \$138 billion out on the street before it is too late for many of these hard-hit businesses. This legislation is targeted, addresses a dire need across the Nation, and requires no additional Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker and her leadership to reconsider this tactic and allow this legislation to come to the floor for a vote. I am confident it will receive bipartisan support.

#### CONGRATULATING DR. JUDY WHITE

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Judy White on her retirement from the Riverside County Office of Education.

Known as a history maker and stereotype breaker, Dr. White has been a distinguished educator for the past 40 years. Most recently, she served as the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools, where she led the county's 515 schools, ensuring that all 430,000 students in the county received the quality education they deserve.

Dr. White has dedicated her career to bettering public education throughout the Inland Empire. She encouraged students to pursue their educational dreams, and she secured millions of dollars in funding to bridge the digital divide in our communities.

There is no doubt that Dr. White has been an incredible asset to the students of Riverside County, and I am glad to have had the pleasure of working with her. She sets a high bar in everything she does, and I wish her a happy retirement and all the best in her future endeavors.

#### RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR AIR AMERICA PILOTS

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think, without question, one of the parts of our history that has been underreported is that of the great wars against communism, one of which was the Vietnam war.

One part of the Vietnam war that hasn't been discussed enough is that of Air America. It was a CIA-run operation in which they would take airlines, scrub off the markings related to the U.S. Air Force, and then fly over Laos maybe to drop off supplies, maybe to do rescue missions, both with regard to American troops and our Hmong allies.

I have the honor to introduce, together along with Congresswoman MALONEY, the bipartisan Air America Act, which will give those people who risked their lives, and many of them have died, the same retirement benefits as other people who fought for the military in the Vietnam war.

But today I would just like to salute those veterans of Air America, many of whom are still alive, some in my district, and hope that we act quickly to give them the retirement benefits that they should have had many years ago.

#### REMEMBERING DR. ROGER MANDLE

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last week the arts and education communities lost a giant when Dr. Roger Mandle, the former president of the Rhode Island School of Design for more than a decade, passed away in Dartmouth, Massachusetts, at the age of 79.

I was fortunate to work closely with President Mandle during my time as mayor of Providence. He was a passionate advocate for the humanities and a visionary leader who ensured that Rhode Island remained home to the leading arts and design school in the world.

Most of all, he was an extraordinary human being and talented leader who sought to leave our world in better shape than he found it.

He recognized the influential post he held as a civic leader in the city of Providence, he understood fully the importance that great universities and colleges have to the success of cities, and he worked to ensure that RISD was an asset for Rhode Island's capital city.

He will be deeply missed by all who knew him.

My thoughts and prayers are with Roger's wife, the renowned abstract artist Gayle Wells Mandle, and their entire family today.

#### LAKES FREEMAN AND SHAFER

(Mr. BAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise on behalf of the communities and the residents surrounding Lakes Freeman and Shafer.

This summer, these communities witnessed the water levels in Lake Freeman reach a dangerously low level. The low water levels were brought on by drought, but were exacerbated by a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ruling meant to protect several species of mussels.

However well-intended the ruling, it is having devastating consequences for these communities and the city of Monticello. Local businesses are struggling to get by, property values are decreasing, and the ecosystem of the lake is threatened.

Fish and Wildlife have the power to resolve this issue, but the agency has been unable to adjust to realtime circumstances.

I brought this issue to the attention of the Department of the Interior. My hope is that our government can be responsive to the concerns of the people on a problem they have helped create.

# WE MUST PASS BIPARTISAN COVID RELIEF

(Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak of the urgent need to pass bipartisan COVID-19 relief legislation as Congress works to conclude our work this year.

Families, businesses, and workers in New Hampshire are feeling the continued pain and impact of this pandemic as cases reach record highs in my State and hospitals and frontline health workers brace for the expected surge.

This week, I was pleased to see Democrats and Republicans in the House and the Senate come together to find common ground and release a promising framework that we should consider immediately. This legislation would bolster our public health and economic response to COVID-19 to help us get through the long, cold, dark winter ahead.

Democrats and Republicans won't get everything they want, but we need to come together and put politics aside.

This legislation includes new funding for the Paycheck Protection Program for small businesses, State and local funding for our first responders, extended unemployment, and critical funding to help with the distribution of the promising COVID-19 vaccine, as well as \$5 billion in funding to combat the opioid epidemic, which, tragically, continues to rage.

It is time to come together and get the job done.

□ 0915

# MARIJUANA OPPORTUNITY REINVESTMENT AND EXPUNGEMENT ACT OF 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1244, I call up the bill (H.R. 3884) to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Pursuant to House Resolution 1244, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-67, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 116-607, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H. R. 3884

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2020" or the "MORE Act of 2020".

## SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) The communities that have been most harmed by cannabis prohibition are benefiting the least from the legal marijuana marketplace.

(2) A legacy of racial and ethnic injustices, compounded by the disproportionate collateral consequences of 80 years of cannabis prohibition enforcement, now limits participation in the industry.

(3) 36 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam have adopted laws allowing legal access to cannabis, and 15 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands have adopted laws legalizing cannabis for adult recreational use.

(4) A total of 47 States have reformed their laws pertaining to cannabis despite the Schedule I status of marijuana and its Federal criminalization.

(5) Legal cannabis sales totaled \$9.5 billion in 2017 and are projected to reach \$23 billion by 2022.

(6) According to the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), enforcing cannabis prohibition laws costs taxpayers approximately \$3.6 billion a year.

(7) The continued enforcement of cannabis prohibition laws results in over 600,000 arrests annually, disproportionately impacting people of color who are almost 4 times more likely to be arrested for cannabis possession than their White counterparts, despite equal rates of use across populations.

(8) People of color have been historically targeted by discriminatory sentencing practices resulting in Black men receiving drug sentences that are 13.1 percent longer than sentences imposed for White men and Latinos being nearly 6.5 times more likely to receive a Federal sentence for cannabis possession than non-Hispanic Whites.

(9) In 2013, simple cannabis possession was the fourth most common cause of deportation for any offense and the most common cause of deportation for drug law violations.

(10) Fewer than one-fifth of cannabis business owners identify as minorities and only approximately 4 percent are black.

(11) Applicants for cannabis licenses are limited by numerous laws, regulations, and exorbitant permit applications, licensing fees, and costs in these States, which can require more than \$700,000.

(12) Historically disproportionate arrest and conviction rates make it particularly difficult for people of color to enter the legal cannabis marketplace, as most States bar these individuals from participating.

(13) Federal law severely limits access to loans and capital for cannabis businesses, disproportionately impacting minority small business owners.

(14) Some States and municipalities have taken proactive steps to mitigate inequalities in the legal cannabis marketplace and ensure equal participation in the industry.

## SEC. 3. DECRIMINALIZATION OF CANNABIS.

(a) CANNABIS REMOVED FROM SCHEDULE OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.—

(1) REMOVAL IN STATUTE.—Subsection (c) of schedule I of section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812) is amended—

(A) by striking "(10) Marihuana."; and

(B) by striking "(17) Tetrahydrocannabinols, except for tetrahydrocannabinols in hemp (as defined in section 297A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946).";

(2) REMOVAL FROM SCHEDULE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall finalize a rulemaking under section 201(a)(2) removing marihuana and tetrahydrocannabinols from the

schedules of controlled substances. For the purposes of the Controlled Substances Act, marihuana and tetrahydrocannabinols shall each be deemed to be a drug or other substance that does not meet the requirements for inclusion in any schedule. A rulemaking under this paragraph shall be considered to have taken effect as of the date of enactment of this Act for purposes of any offense committed, case pending, conviction entered, and, in the case of a juvenile, any offense committed, case pending, and adjudication of juvenile delinquency entered before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.—The Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 102(44) (21 U.S.C. 802(44)), by striking "marihuana,";

(2) in section 401(b) (21 U.S.C. 841(b))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (vi), by inserting "or" after the semicolon;

(II) by striking clause (vii); and

(III) by redesignating clause (viii) as clause (vii);

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (vi), by inserting "or" after the semicolon;

(II) by striking clause (vii); and

(III) by redesignating clause (viii) as clause (vii);

(iii) in subparagraph (C), in the first sentence, by striking "subparagraphs (A), (B), and (D)" and inserting "subparagraphs (A) and (B)";

(iv) by striking subparagraph (D);

(v) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D); and

(vi) in subparagraph (D)(i), as so redesignated, by striking "subparagraphs (C) and (D)" and inserting "subparagraph (C)";

(B) by striking paragraph (4); and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively;

(3) in section 402(c)(2)(B) (21 U.S.C. 842(c)(2)(B)), by striking "marihuana,";

(4) in section 403(d)(1) (21 U.S.C. 843(d)(1)), by striking "marihuana,";

(5) in section 418(a) (21 U.S.C. 859(a)), by striking the last sentence;

(6) in section 419(a) (21 U.S.C. 860(a)), by striking the last sentence;

(7) in section 422(d) (21 U.S.C. 863(d))—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "marijuana,"; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking "such as a marihuana cigarette,"; and

(8) in section 516(d) (21 U.S.C. 886(d)), by striking "section 401(b)(6)" each place the term appears and inserting "section 401(b)(5)".

(c) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM DRUG CONTROL ACT OF 1986.—The National Forest System Drug Control Act of 1986 (16 U.S.C. 559b et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 15002(a) (16 U.S.C. 559b(a)) by striking "marijuana and other";

(B) in section 15003(2) (16 U.S.C. 559c(2)) by striking "marijuana and other"; and

(C) in section 15004(2) (16 U.S.C. 559d(2)) by striking "marijuana and other".

(2) INTERSECTION OF COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (1)(e), by striking "marihuana,"; and

(B) in subsection (2) by striking "marihuana".

(3) FMCSA PROVISIONS.—

(A) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 31301(5) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "section 31306," and inserting "sections 31306, 31306a, and subsections (b) and (c) of section 31310,".

(B) DEFINITION.—Section 31306(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking “means any substance” and inserting the following: “means—

“(A) any substance”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and

“(B) any substance not covered under subparagraph (A) that was a substance under such section as of December 1, 2018, and specified by the Secretary of Transportation.”.

(C) **DISQUALIFICATIONS.**—Section 31310(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) In this subsection and subsection (c), the term ‘controlled substance’ has the meaning given such term in section 31306(a).”.

(4) **FAA PROVISIONS.**—Section 45101 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “means any substance” and inserting the following: “means—

“(A) any substance”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and

“(B) any substance not covered under subparagraph (A) that was a substance under such section as of December 1, 2018, and specified by the Secretary of Transportation.”.

(5) **FRA PROVISIONS.**—Section 20140(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “means any substance” and inserting the following: “means—

“(A) any substance”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and

“(B) any substance not covered under subparagraph (A) that was a substance under such section as of December 1, 2018, and specified by the Secretary of Transportation.”.

(6) **FTA PROVISIONS.**—Section 5331(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “means any substance” and inserting the following: “means—

“(A) any substance”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and

“(B) any substance not covered under subparagraph (A) that was a substance under such section as of December 1, 2018, and whose use the Secretary of Transportation decides has a risk to transportation safety.”.

(d) **RETROACTIVITY.**—The amendments made by this section to the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) are retroactive and shall apply to any offense committed, case pending, conviction entered, and, in the case of a juvenile, any offense committed, case pending, or adjudication of juvenile delinquency entered before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) **EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.**—Nothing in this subtitle shall affect or modify—

(1) the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.);

(2) section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262); or

(3) the authority of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and the Secretary of Health and Human Services—

(A) under—

(i) the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.); or

(ii) section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262); or

(B) to promulgate Federal regulations and guidelines that relate to products containing cannabis or cannabis-derived compounds under the Act described in subparagraph (A)(i) or the section described in subparagraph (A)(ii).

(f) **PUBLIC MEETINGS.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall hold not less than one public meeting to address the regulation, safety, manufacturing, product quality, marketing, labeling, and sale of products containing cannabis or cannabis-derived compounds.

(g) **SPECIAL RULE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEE TESTING.**—Section 503 of the Supplemental Ap-

propriations Act, 1987 (5 U.S.C. 7301 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **MARIJUANA.**—

“(1) **CONTINUED TESTING.**—Notwithstanding the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2020 and the amendments made thereby, the Secretary of Health and Human Services may continue to include marijuana for purposes of drug testing of Federal employees subject to this section, Executive Order 12564, or other applicable Federal laws and orders.

“(2) **DEFINITION.**—The term ‘marijuana’ has the meaning given to the term ‘marihuana’ in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) on the day before the date of enactment of the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2020.”.

(h) **SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN REGULATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendments made by this section may not be construed to abridge the authority of the Secretary of Transportation, or the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, to regulate and screen for the use of a controlled substance.

(2) **CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “controlled substance” means—

(A) any substance covered under section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) on the day before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) any substance not covered under subparagraph (A) that was a substance covered under section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) on December 1, 2018, and specified by the Secretary of Transportation.

#### **SEC. 4. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF CANNABIS BUSINESS OWNERS AND EMPLOYEES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Bureau of Labor Statistics shall regularly compile, maintain, and make public data on the demographics of—

(1) individuals who are business owners in the cannabis industry; and

(2) individuals who are employed in the cannabis industry.

(b) **DEMOGRAPHIC DATA.**—The data collected under subsection (a) shall include data regarding—

(1) age;

(2) certifications and licenses;

(3) disability status;

(4) educational attainment;

(5) family and marital status;

(6) nativity;

(7) race and Hispanic ethnicity;

(8) school enrollment;

(9) veteran status; and

(10) sex.

(c) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—The name, address, and other identifying information of individuals employed in the cannabis industry shall be kept confidential by the Bureau and not be made available to the public.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CANNABIS.**—The term “cannabis” means either marijuana or cannabis as defined under the State law authorizing the sale or use of cannabis in which the individual or entity is located.

(2) **CANNABIS INDUSTRY.**—The term “cannabis industry” means an individual or entity that is licensed or permitted under a State or local law to engage in commercial cannabis-related activity.

(3) **OWNER.**—The term “owner” means an individual or entity that is defined as an owner under the State or local law where the individual or business is licensed or permitted.

#### **SEC. 5. CREATION OF OPPORTUNITY TRUST FUND AND IMPOSITION OF TAXES WITH RESPECT TO CANNABIS PRODUCTS.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUST FUND.**—Subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### **“SEC. 9512. OPPORTUNITY TRUST FUND.**

“(a) **CREATION OF TRUST FUND.**—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a

trust fund to be known as the ‘Opportunity Trust Fund’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Trust Fund’), consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to such fund as provided in this section or section 9602(b).

“(b) **TRANSFERS TO TRUST FUND.**—There are hereby appropriated to the Trust Fund amounts equivalent to the net revenues received in the Treasury from the taxes imposed under chapter 56.

“(c) **EXPENDITURES.**—Amounts in the Trust Fund shall be available, without further appropriation, only as follows:

“(1) 50 percent to the Attorney General to carry out section 3052(a) of part OO of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

“(2) 10 percent to the Attorney General to carry out section 3052(b) of part OO of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

“(3) 20 percent to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to carry out section 6(b)(1) of the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2020.

“(4) 20 percent to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to carry out section 6(b)(2) of the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2020.”.

(b) **CANNABIS REVENUE AND REGULATION ACT.**—Subtitle E of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

#### **“CHAPTER 56—CANNABIS PRODUCTS**

“SUBCHAPTER A. TAX ON CANNABIS PRODUCTS

“SUBCHAPTER B. OCCUPATIONAL TAX

“SUBCHAPTER C. BOND AND PERMITS

“SUBCHAPTER D. OPERATIONS

“SUBCHAPTER E. PENALTIES

#### **“Subchapter A—Tax on Cannabis Products**

“Sec. 5901. Imposition of tax.

“Sec. 5902. Definitions.

“Sec. 5903. Liability and method of payment.

“Sec. 5904. Exemption from tax; transfers in bond.

“Sec. 5905. Credit, refund, or drawback of tax.

#### **“SEC. 5901. IMPOSITION OF TAX.**

“(a) **IMPOSITION OF TAX.**—There is hereby imposed on any cannabis product produced in or imported into the United States a tax equal to—

“(1) for any such product removed during the first 5 calendar years ending after the date on which this chapter becomes effective, the applicable percentage of such product’s removal price, and

“(2) for any product removed during any calendar year after the calendar years described in paragraph (1), the applicable equivalent amount.

“(b) **APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.**—For purposes of subsection (a)(1), the applicable percentage shall be determined as follows:

“(1) For any cannabis product removed during the first 2 calendar years ending after the date on which this chapter becomes effective, 5 percent.

“(2) For any cannabis product removed during the calendar year after the last calendar year to which paragraph (1) applies, 6 percent.

“(3) For any cannabis product removed during the calendar year after the calendar year to which paragraph (2) applies, 7 percent.

“(4) For any cannabis product removed during the calendar year after the calendar year to which paragraph (3) applies, 8 percent.

“(c) **APPLICABLE EQUIVALENT AMOUNT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the term ‘applicable equivalent amount’ means, with respect to any cannabis product removed during any calendar year, an amount equal to—

“(A) in the case of any cannabis product not described in subparagraph (B), the product of the applicable rate per ounce multiplied by the number of ounces of such product (and a proportionate tax at the like rate on all fractional parts of an ounce of such product), and

“(B) in the case of any THC-measurable cannabis product, the product of the applicable rate per gram multiplied by the number of grams of tetrahydrocannabinol in such product (and a proportionate tax at the like rate on all fractional parts of a gram of tetrahydrocannabinol in such product).”

“(2) APPLICABLE RATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the term ‘applicable rate per ounce’ means, with respect to any cannabis product removed during any calendar year, 8 percent of the prevailing sales price of cannabis flowers sold in the United States during the 12-month period ending one calendar quarter before such calendar year, expressed on a per ounce basis, as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) THC-MEASURABLE CANNABIS PRODUCTS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), the term ‘applicable rate per gram’ means, with respect to any cannabis product removed during any calendar year, 8 percent of the prevailing sales price of tetrahydrocannabinol sold in the United States during the 12-month period ending one calendar quarter before such calendar year, expressed on a per gram basis, as determined by the Secretary.

“(d) TIME OF ATTACHMENT ON CANNABIS PRODUCTS.—The tax under this section shall attach to any cannabis product as soon as such product is in existence as such, whether it be subsequently separated or transferred into any other substance, either in the process of original production or by any subsequent process.

“SEC. 5902. DEFINITIONS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS RELATED TO CANNABIS PRODUCTS.—For purposes of this chapter—

“(1) CANNABIS PRODUCT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘cannabis product’ means any article which contains (or consists of) cannabis.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term ‘cannabis product’ shall not include an FDA-approved article or industrial hemp.

“(C) FDA-APPROVED ARTICLE.—The term ‘FDA-approved article’ means any article if the producer or importer thereof demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Health and Human Services that such article is—

“(i) a drug—

“(I) that is approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act, or

“(II) for which an investigational use exemption has been authorized under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or under section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act, or

“(ii) a combination product (as described in section 503(g) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act), the constituent parts of which were approved or cleared under section 505, 510(k), or 515 of such Act.

“(D) INDUSTRIAL HEMP.—The term ‘industrial hemp’ means the plant *Cannabis sativa* L. and any part of such plant, whether growing or not, with a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration of not more than 0.3 percent on a dry weight basis.

“(2) THC-MEASURABLE CANNABIS PRODUCT.—The term ‘THC-measurable cannabis product’ means any cannabis product—

“(A) with respect to which the Secretary has made a determination that the amount of tetrahydrocannabinol in such product can be measured with a high degree of accuracy, or

“(B) which is not cannabis flower and the concentration of tetrahydrocannabinol in which is significantly higher than the average such concentration in cannabis flower.

“(3) CANNABIS.—The term ‘cannabis’ has the meaning given such term under section 102(16) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(16)).

“(b) DEFINITIONS RELATED TO CANNABIS ENTERPRISES.—For purposes of this chapter—

“(1) CANNABIS ENTERPRISE.—The term ‘cannabis enterprise’ means a producer, importer, or export warehouse proprietor.

“(2) PRODUCER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘producer’ means any person who plants, cultivates, harvests, grows, manufactures, produces, compounds, converts, processes, prepares, or packages any cannabis product.

“(B) PERSONAL USE EXCEPTION.—Subject to regulation prescribed by the Secretary, the term ‘producer’ shall not include any individual otherwise described in subparagraph (A) if the only cannabis product described in such subparagraph with respect to such individual is for personal or family use and not for sale.

“(3) IMPORTER.—The term ‘importer’ means any person who—

“(A) is in the United States and to whom non-tax-paid cannabis products, produced in a foreign country or a possession of the United States, are shipped or consigned,

“(B) removes cannabis products for sale or consumption in the United States from a customs bonded warehouse, or

“(C) smuggles or otherwise unlawfully brings any cannabis product into the United States.

“(4) EXPORT WAREHOUSE PROPRIETOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘export warehouse proprietor’ means any person who operates an export warehouse.

“(B) EXPORT WAREHOUSE.—The term ‘export warehouse’ means a bonded internal revenue warehouse for the storage of cannabis products, upon which the internal revenue tax has not been paid—

“(i) for subsequent shipment to a foreign country or a possession of the United States, or

“(ii) for consumption beyond the jurisdiction of the internal revenue laws of the United States.

“(5) CANNABIS PRODUCTION FACILITY.—The term ‘cannabis production facility’ means an establishment which is qualified under subchapter C to perform any operation for which such qualification is required under such subchapter.

“(c) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this chapter—

“(1) PRODUCE.—The term ‘produce’ includes any activity described in subsection (b)(2)(A).

“(2) REMOVAL; REMOVE.—The terms ‘removal’ or ‘remove’ means—

“(A) the transfer of cannabis products from the premises of a producer (or the transfer of such products from the bonded premises of a producer to a non-bonded premises of such producer),

“(B) release of such products from customs custody, or

“(C) smuggling or other unlawful importation of such products into the United States.

“(3) REMOVAL PRICE.—The term ‘removal price’ means—

“(A) except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the price for which the cannabis product is sold in the sale which occurs in connection with the removal of such product,

“(B) in the case of any such sale which is described in section 5903(c), the price determined under such section, and

“(C) if there is no sale which occurs in connection with such removal, the price which would be determined under section 5903(c) if such product were sold at a price which cannot be determined.

“SEC. 5903. LIABILITY AND METHOD OF PAYMENT.

“(a) LIABILITY FOR TAX.—

“(1) ORIGINAL LIABILITY.—The producer or importer of any cannabis product shall be liable for the taxes imposed thereon by section 5901.

“(2) TRANSFER OF LIABILITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—When cannabis products are transferred, without payment of tax, pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) of section 5904—

“(i) except as provided in clause (ii), the transferee shall become liable for the tax upon receipt by the transferee of such articles, and

the transferor shall thereupon be relieved of their liability for such tax, and

“(ii) in the case of cannabis products which are released in bond from customs custody for transfer to the bonded premises of a producer, the transferee shall become liable for the tax on such articles upon release from customs custody, and the importer shall thereupon be relieved of their liability for such tax.

“(B) RETURNED TO BOND.—All provisions of this chapter applicable to cannabis products in bond shall be applicable to such articles returned to bond upon withdrawal from the market or returned to bond after previous removal for a tax-exempt purpose.

“(b) METHOD OF PAYMENT OF TAX.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) TAXES PAID ON BASIS OF RETURN.—The taxes imposed by section 5901 shall be paid on the basis of return. The Secretary shall, by regulations, prescribe the period or the event to be covered by such return and the information to be furnished on such return.

“(B) APPLICATION TO TRANSFEREES.—In the case of any transfer to which subsection (a)(2)(A) applies, the tax under section 5901 on the transferee shall (if not otherwise relieved by reason of a subsequent transfer to which such subsection applies) be imposed with respect to the removal of the cannabis product from the bonded premises of the transferee.

“(C) POSTPONEMENT.—Any postponement under this subsection of the payment of taxes determined at the time of removal shall be conditioned upon the filing of such additional bonds, and upon compliance with such requirements, as the Secretary may prescribe for the protection of the revenue. The Secretary may, by regulations, require payment of tax on the basis of a return prior to removal of the cannabis products where a person defaults in the postponed payment of tax on the basis of a return under this subsection or regulations prescribed thereunder.

“(D) ADMINISTRATION AND PENALTIES.—All administrative and penalty provisions of this title, insofar as applicable, shall apply to any tax imposed by section 5901.

“(2) TIME FOR PAYMENT OF TAXES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, in the case of taxes on cannabis products removed during any semi-monthly period under bond for deferred payment of tax, the last day for payment of such taxes shall be the 14th day after the last day of such semi-monthly period.

“(B) IMPORTED ARTICLES.—In the case of cannabis products which are imported into the United States, the following provisions shall apply:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The last day for payment of tax shall be the 14th day after the last day of the semi-monthly period during which the article is entered into the customs territory of the United States.

“(ii) SPECIAL RULE FOR ENTRY OF WAREHOUSING.—Except as provided in clause (iv), in the case of an entry for warehousing, the last day for payment of tax shall not be later than the 14th day after the last day of the semi-monthly period during which the article is removed from the first such warehouse.

“(iii) FOREIGN TRADE ZONES.—Except as provided in clause (iv) and in regulations prescribed by the Secretary, articles brought into a foreign trade zone shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be treated for purposes of this subsection as if such zone were a single customs warehouse.

“(iv) EXCEPTION FOR ARTICLES DESTINED FOR EXPORT.—Clauses (ii) and (iii) shall not apply to any article which is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary to be destined for export.

“(C) CANNABIS PRODUCTS BROUGHT INTO THE UNITED STATES FROM PUERTO RICO.—In the case of cannabis products which are brought into the United States from Puerto Rico and subject to tax under section 7652, the last day for payment

of tax shall be the 14th day after the last day of the semimonthly period during which the article is brought into the United States.

“(D) SPECIAL RULE WHERE DUE DATE FALLS ON SATURDAY, SUNDAY, OR HOLIDAY.—Notwithstanding section 7503, if, but for this subparagraph, the due date under this paragraph would fall on a Saturday, Sunday, or a legal holiday (as defined in section 7503), such due date shall be the immediately preceding day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or such a holiday.

“(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR UNLAWFULLY PRODUCED CANNABIS PRODUCTS.—In the case of any cannabis products produced in the United States at any place other than the premises of a producer that has filed the bond and obtained the permit required under this chapter, tax shall be due and payable immediately upon production.

“(3) PAYMENT BY ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER.—Any person who in any 12-month period, ending December 31, was liable for a gross amount equal to or exceeding \$5,000,000 in taxes imposed on cannabis products by section 5901 (or section 7652) shall pay such taxes during the succeeding calendar year by electronic fund transfer (as defined in section 5061(e)(2)) to a Federal Reserve Bank. Rules similar to the rules of section 5061(e)(3) shall apply to the \$5,000,000 amount specified in the preceding sentence.

“(c) DETERMINATION OF PRICE.—

“(1) CONSTRUCTIVE SALE PRICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If an article is sold directly to consumers, sold on consignment, or sold (otherwise than through an arm's length transaction) at less than the fair market price, or if the price for which the article sold cannot be determined, the tax under section 5901(a) shall be computed on the price for which such articles are sold, in the ordinary course of trade, by producers thereof, as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) ARM'S LENGTH.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a sale is considered to be made under circumstances otherwise than at arm's length if—

“(I) the parties are members of the same controlled group, whether or not such control is actually exercised to influence the sale price, or

“(II) the parties are members of a family, as defined in section 267(c)(4), or

“(III) the sale is made pursuant to special arrangements between a producer and a purchaser.

“(ii) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘controlled group’ has the meaning given to such term by subsection (a) of section 1563, except that ‘more than 50 percent’ shall be substituted for ‘at least 80 percent’ each place it appears in such subsection.

“(II) CONTROLLED GROUPS WHICH INCLUDE NONINCORPORATED PERSONS.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, principles similar to the principles of subclause (I) shall apply to a group of persons under common control where one or more of such persons is not a corporation.

“(2) CONTAINERS, PACKING AND TRANSPORTATION CHARGES.—In determining, for the purposes of this chapter, the price for which an article is sold, there shall be included any charge for coverings and containers of whatever nature, and any charge incident to placing the article in condition packed ready for shipment, but there shall be excluded the amount of tax imposed by this chapter, whether or not stated as a separate charge. A transportation, delivery, insurance, installation, or other charge (not required by the preceding sentence to be included) shall be excluded from the price only if the amount thereof is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary in accordance with regulations.

“(3) DETERMINATION OF APPLICABLE EQUIVALENT AMOUNTS.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply for purposes of section 5901(c) only to the extent that the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(d) PARTIAL PAYMENTS AND INSTALLMENT ACCOUNTS.—

“(1) PARTIAL PAYMENTS.—In the case of—

“(A) a contract for the sale of an article wherein it is provided that the price shall be paid by installments and title to the article sold does not pass until a future date notwithstanding partial payment by installments,

“(B) a conditional sale, or

“(C) a chattel mortgage arrangement wherein it is provided that the sales price shall be paid in installments,

there shall be paid upon each payment with respect to the article a percentage of such payment equal to the rate of tax in effect on the date such payment is due.

“(2) SALES OF INSTALLMENT ACCOUNTS.—If installment accounts, with respect to payments on which tax is being computed as provided in paragraph (1), are sold or otherwise disposed of, then paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to any subsequent payments on such accounts (other than subsequent payments on returned accounts with respect to which credit or refund is allowable by reason of section 6416(b)(5)), but instead—

“(A) there shall be paid an amount equal to the difference between—

“(i) the tax previously paid on the payments on such installment accounts, and

“(ii) the total tax which would be payable if such installment accounts had not been sold or otherwise disposed of (computed as provided in paragraph (1)), except that

“(B) if any such sale is pursuant to the order of, or subject to the approval of, a court of competent jurisdiction in a bankruptcy or insolvency proceeding, the amount computed under subparagraph (A) shall not exceed the sum of the amounts computed by multiplying—

“(i) the proportionate share of the amount for which such accounts are sold which is allocable to each unpaid installment payment, by

“(ii) the rate of tax under this chapter in effect on the date such unpaid installment payment is or was due.

The sum of the amounts payable under this subsection in respect of the sale of any article shall not exceed the total tax.

“SEC. 5904. EXEMPTION FROM TAX; TRANSFERS IN BOND.

“(a) EXEMPTION FROM TAX.—Cannabis products on which the internal revenue tax has not been paid or determined may, subject to such regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe, be withdrawn from the bonded premises of any producer in approved containers free of tax and not for resale for use—

“(1) exclusively in scientific research by a laboratory,

“(2) by a proprietor of a cannabis production facility in research, development, or testing (other than consumer testing or other market analysis) of processes, systems, materials, or equipment, relating to cannabis or cannabis operations, under such limitations and conditions as to quantities, use, and accountability as the Secretary may by regulations require for the protection of the revenue, or

“(3) by the United States or any governmental agency thereof, any State, any political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia, for nonconsumption purposes.

“(b) CANNABIS PRODUCTS TRANSFERRED OR REMOVED IN BOND FROM DOMESTIC FACTORIES AND EXPORT WAREHOUSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to such regulations and under such bonds as the Secretary shall prescribe, a producer or export warehouse proprietor may transfer cannabis products, without payment of tax, to the bonded premises of another producer or export warehouse proprietor, or remove such articles, without payment of tax, for shipment to a foreign country or a possession of the United States, or for consumption beyond the jurisdiction of the internal revenue laws of the United States.

“(2) LABELING.—Cannabis products may not be transferred or removed under this subsection unless such products bear such marks, labels, or

notices as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe.

“(c) CANNABIS PRODUCTS RELEASED IN BOND FROM CUSTOMS CUSTODY.—Cannabis products imported or brought into the United States may be released from customs custody, without payment of tax, for delivery to a producer or export warehouse proprietor if such articles are not put up in packages, in accordance with such regulations and under such bond as the Secretary shall prescribe.

“(d) CANNABIS PRODUCTS EXPORTED AND RETURNED.—Cannabis products classifiable under item 9801.00.10 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (relating to duty on certain articles previously exported and returned), as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2020, may be released from customs custody, without payment of that part of the duty attributable to the internal revenue tax for delivery to the original producer of such cannabis products or to the export warehouse proprietor authorized by such producer to receive such products, in accordance with such regulations and under such bond as the Secretary shall prescribe. Upon such release such products shall be subject to this chapter as if they had not been exported or otherwise removed from internal revenue bond.

“SEC. 5905. CREDIT, REFUND, OR DRAWBACK OF TAX.

“(a) CREDIT OR REFUND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Credit or refund of any tax imposed by this chapter or section 7652 shall be allowed or made (without interest) to the cannabis enterprise on proof satisfactory to the Secretary that the claimant cannabis enterprise has paid the tax on—

“(A) cannabis products withdrawn from the market by the claimant, or

“(B) such products lost (otherwise than by theft) or destroyed, by fire, casualty, or act of God, while in the possession or ownership of the claimant.

“(2) CANNABIS PRODUCTS LOST OR DESTROYED IN BOND.—

“(A) EXTENT OF LOSS ALLOWANCE.—No tax shall be collected in respect of cannabis products lost or destroyed while in bond, except that such tax shall be collected—

“(i) in the case of loss by theft, unless the Secretary finds that the theft occurred without connivance, collusion, fraud, or negligence on the part of the proprietor of the cannabis production facility, owner, consignor, consignee, bailee, or carrier, or their employees or agents,

“(ii) in the case of voluntary destruction, unless such destruction is carried out as provided in paragraph (3), and

“(iii) in the case of an unexplained shortage of cannabis products.

“(B) PROOF OF LOSS.—In any case in which cannabis products are lost or destroyed, whether by theft or otherwise, the Secretary may require the proprietor of a cannabis production facility or other person liable for the tax to file a claim for relief from the tax and submit proof as to the cause of such loss. In every case where it appears that the loss was by theft, the burden shall be upon the proprietor of the cannabis production facility or other person responsible for the tax under section 5901 to establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such loss did not occur as the result of connivance, collusion, fraud, or negligence on the part of the proprietor of the cannabis production facility, owner, consignor, consignee, bailee, or carrier, or their employees or agents.

“(C) REFUND OF TAX.—In any case where the tax would not be collectible by virtue of subparagraph (A), but such tax has been paid, the Secretary shall refund such tax.

“(D) LIMITATIONS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (E), no tax shall be abated, remitted, credited, or refunded under this paragraph where the loss occurred after the tax was determined. The abatement, remission, credit, or refund of taxes provided for by subparagraphs (A)



and (C) in the case of loss of cannabis products by theft shall only be allowed to the extent that the claimant is not indemnified against or recompensed in respect of the tax for such loss.

“(E) **APPLICABILITY.**—The provisions of this paragraph shall extend to and apply in respect of cannabis products lost after the tax was determined and before completion of the physical removal of the cannabis products from the bonded premises.

“(3) **VOLUNTARY DESTRUCTION.**—The proprietor of a cannabis production facility or other persons liable for the tax imposed by this chapter or by section 7652 with respect to any cannabis product in bond may voluntarily destroy such products, but only if such destruction is under such supervision and under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.

“(4) **LIMITATION.**—Any claim for credit or refund of tax under this subsection shall be filed within 6 months after the date of the withdrawal from the market, loss, or destruction of the products to which the claim relates, and shall be in such form and contain such information as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe.

“(b) **DRAWBACK OF TAX.**—There shall be an allowance of drawback of tax paid on cannabis products, when shipped from the United States, in accordance with such regulations and upon the filing of such bond as the Secretary shall prescribe.

#### “Subchapter B—Occupational Tax

“Sec. 5911. Imposition and rate of tax.

“Sec. 5912. Payment of tax.

“Sec. 5913. Provisions relating to liability for occupational taxes.

“Sec. 5914. Application to State laws.

#### “SEC. 5911. IMPOSITION AND RATE OF TAX.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any person engaged in business as a producer or an export warehouse proprietor shall pay a tax of \$1,000 per year (referred to in this subchapter as an ‘occupational tax’) in respect of each premises at which such business is carried on.

“(b) **PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO REGISTER.**—Any person engaged in business as a producer or an export warehouse proprietor who willfully fails to pay the occupation tax shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both, for each such offense.

#### “SEC. 5912. PAYMENT OF TAX.

“(a) **CONDITION PRECEDENT TO CARRYING ON BUSINESS.**—No person shall be engaged in or carry on any trade or business subject to the occupational tax until such person has paid such tax.

“(b) **COMPUTATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The occupational tax shall be imposed—

“(A) as of on the first day of July in each year, or

“(B) on commencing any trade or business on which such tax is imposed.

“(2) **PERIOD.**—In the case of a tax imposed under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), the occupational tax shall be reckoned for 1 year, and in the case of subparagraph (B) of such paragraph, it shall be reckoned proportionately, from the first day of the month in which the liability to such tax commenced, to and including the 30th day of June following.

“(c) **METHOD OF PAYMENT.**—

“(1) **PAYMENT BY RETURN.**—The occupational tax shall be paid on the basis of a return under such regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe.

“(2) **STAMP DENOTING PAYMENT OF TAX.**—After receiving a properly executed return and remittance of any occupational tax, the Secretary shall issue to the taxpayer an appropriate stamp as a receipt denoting payment of the tax. This paragraph shall not apply in the case of a return covering liability for a past period.

#### “SEC. 5913. PROVISIONS RELATING TO LIABILITY FOR OCCUPATIONAL TAXES.

“(a) **PARTNERS.**—Any number of persons doing business in partnership at any one place

shall be required to pay a single occupational tax.

“(b) **DIFFERENT BUSINESSES OF SAME OWNERSHIP AND LOCATION.**—Whenever more than one of the pursuits or occupations described in this subchapter are carried on in the same place by the same person at the same time, except as otherwise provided in this subchapter, the occupational tax shall be paid for each according to the rates severally prescribed.

“(c) **BUSINESSES IN MORE THAN ONE LOCATION.**—

“(1) **LIABILITY FOR TAX.**—The payment of the occupational tax shall not exempt from an additional occupational tax the person carrying on a trade or business in any other place than that stated in the records of the Internal Revenue Service.

“(2) **STORAGE.**—Nothing contained in paragraph (1) shall require imposition of an occupational tax for the storage of cannabis products at a location other than the place where such products are sold or offered for sale.

“(3) **PLACE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this section, the term ‘place’ means the entire office, plant or area of the business in any one location under the same proprietorship.

“(B) **DIVISIONS.**—For purposes of this paragraph, any passageways, streets, highways, rail crossings, waterways, or partitions dividing the premises shall not be deemed sufficient separation to require an additional occupational tax, if the various divisions are otherwise contiguous.

“(d) **DEATH OR CHANGE OF LOCATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to the person who has paid the occupational tax for the carrying on of any business at any place, any person described in paragraph (2) may secure the right to carry on, without incurring any additional occupational tax, the same business at the same place for the remainder of the taxable period for which the occupational tax was paid.

“(2) **ELIGIBLE PERSONS.**—The persons described in this paragraph are the following:

“(A) The surviving spouse or child, or executor or administrator or other legal representative, of a deceased taxpayer.

“(B) A husband or wife succeeding to the business of his or her living spouse.

“(C) A receiver or trustee in bankruptcy, or an assignee for benefit of creditors.

“(D) The partner or partners remaining after death or withdrawal of a member of a partnership.

“(3) **CHANGE OF LOCATION.**—When any person moves to any place other than the place for which occupational tax was paid for the carrying on of any business, such person may secure the right to carry on, without incurring additional occupational tax, the same business at the new location for the remainder of the taxable period for which the occupational tax was paid. To secure the right to carry on the business without incurring additional occupational tax, the successor, or the person relocating their business, must register the succession or relocation with the Secretary in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

“(e) **FEDERAL AGENCIES OR INSTRUMENTALITIES.**—Any tax imposed by this subchapter shall apply to any agency or instrumentality of the United States unless such agency or instrumentality is granted by statute a specific exemption from such tax.

#### “SEC. 5914. APPLICATION TO STATE LAWS.

“The payment of any tax imposed by this subchapter for carrying on any trade or business shall not be held to—

“(1) exempt any person from any penalty or punishment provided by the laws of any State for carrying on such trade or business within such State, or in any manner to authorize the commencement or continuance of such trade or business contrary to the laws of such State or in places prohibited by municipal law, or

“(2) prohibit any State from placing a duty or tax on the same trade or business, for State or other purposes.

#### “Subchapter C—Bond and Permits

“Sec. 5921. Establishment and bond.

“Sec. 5922. Application for permit.

“Sec. 5923. Permit.

#### “SEC. 5921. ESTABLISHMENT AND BOND.

“(a) **PROHIBITION ON PRODUCTION OUTSIDE OF BONDED CANNABIS PRODUCTION FACILITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as authorized by the Secretary or on the bonded premises of a cannabis production facility duly authorized to produce cannabis products according to law, no cannabis product may be planted, cultivated, harvested, grown, manufactured, produced, compounded, converted, processed, prepared, or packaged in any building or on any premises.

“(2) **AUTHORIZED PRODUCERS ONLY.**—No person other than a producer which has filed the bond required under subsection (b) and received a permit described in section 5923 may produce any cannabis product.

“(3) **PERSONAL USE EXCEPTION.**—This subsection shall not apply with respect to the activities of an individual who is not treated as a producer by reason of section 5902(b)(2)(B).

“(b) **BOND.**—

“(1) **WHEN REQUIRED.**—Every person, before commencing business as a producer or an export warehouse proprietor, shall file such bond, conditioned upon compliance with this chapter and regulations issued thereunder, in such form, amount, and manner as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe. A new or additional bond may be required whenever the Secretary considers such action necessary for the protection of the revenue.

“(2) **APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL.**—No person shall engage in such business until he receives notice of approval of such bond. A bond may be disapproved, upon notice to the principal on the bond, if the Secretary determines that the bond is not adequate to protect the revenue.

“(3) **CANCELLATION.**—Any bond filed hereunder may be canceled, upon notice to the principal on the bond, whenever the Secretary determines that the bond no longer adequately protects the revenue.

#### “SEC. 5922. APPLICATION FOR PERMIT.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Every person, before commencing business as a cannabis enterprise, and at such other time as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe, shall make application for the permit provided for in section 5923. The application shall be in such form as the Secretary shall prescribe and shall set forth, truthfully and accurately, the information called for on the form. Such application may be rejected and the permit denied if the Secretary, after notice and opportunity for hearing, finds that—

“(1) the premises on which it is proposed to conduct the cannabis enterprise are not adequate to protect the revenue, or

“(2) such person (including, in the case of a corporation, any officer, director, or principal stockholder and, in the case of a partnership, a partner)—

“(A) is, by reason of their business experience, financial standing, or trade connections or by reason of previous or current legal proceedings involving a felony violation of any other provision of Federal or State criminal law relating to cannabis or cannabis products, not likely to maintain operations in compliance with this chapter, or

“(B) has failed to disclose any material information required or made any material false statement in the application therefor.

#### “SEC. 5923. PERMIT.

“(a) **ISSUANCE.**—A person shall not engage in business as a cannabis enterprise without a permit to engage in such business. Such permit, conditioned upon compliance with this chapter and regulations issued thereunder, shall be issued in such form and in such manner as the

Secretary shall by regulation prescribe. A new permit may be required at such other time as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe.

“(b) **SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION.**—

“(1) **SHOW CAUSE HEARING.**—If the Secretary has reason to believe that any person holding a permit—

“(A) has not in good faith complied with this chapter, or with any other provision of this title involving intent to defraud,

“(B) has violated the conditions of such permit,

“(C) has failed to disclose any material information required or made any material false statement in the application for such permit,

“(D) has failed to maintain their premises in such manner as to protect the revenue, or

“(E) is, by reason of previous or current legal proceedings involving a felony violation of any other provision of Federal or State criminal law relating to cannabis, not likely to maintain operations in compliance with this chapter, the Secretary shall issue an order, stating the facts charged, citing such person to show cause why their permit should not be suspended or revoked.

“(2) **ACTION FOLLOWING HEARING.**—If, after hearing, the Secretary finds that such person has not shown cause why their permit should not be suspended or revoked, such permit shall be suspended for such period as the Secretary deems proper or shall be revoked.

“(c) **INFORMATION REPORTING.**—The Secretary may require—

“(1) information reporting by any person issued a permit under this section, and

“(2) information reporting by such other persons as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out this chapter.

“(d) **INSPECTION OR DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.**—For rules relating to inspection and disclosure of returns and return information, see section 6103(o).

“**Subchapter D—Operations**

“Sec. 5931. Inventories, reports, and records.

“Sec. 5932. Packaging and labeling.

“Sec. 5933. Purchase, receipt, possession, or sale of cannabis products after removal.

“Sec. 5934. Restrictions relating to marks, labels, notices, and packages.

“Sec. 5935. Restriction on importation of previously exported cannabis products.

“**SEC. 5931. INVENTORIES, REPORTS, AND RECORDS.**

“Every cannabis enterprise shall—

“(1) make a true and accurate inventory at the time of commencing business, at the time of concluding business, and at such other times, in such manner and form, and to include such items, as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe, with such inventories to be subject to verification by any internal revenue officer,

“(2) make reports containing such information, in such form, at such times, and for such periods as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe, and

“(3) keep such records in such manner as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe, with such records to be available for inspection by any internal revenue officer during business hours.

“**SEC. 5932. PACKAGING AND LABELING.**

“(a) **PACKAGES.**—All cannabis products shall, before removal, be put up in such packages as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe.

“(b) **MARKS, LABELS, AND NOTICES.**—Every package of cannabis products shall, before removal, bear the marks, labels, and notices if any, that the Secretary by regulation prescribes.

“(c) **LOTTERY FEATURES.**—No certificate, coupon, or other device purporting to be or to represent a ticket, chance, share, or an interest in, or dependent on, the event of a lottery shall be contained in, attached to, or stamped, marked, written, or printed on any package of cannabis products.

“(d) **INDECENT OR IMMORAL MATERIAL PROHIBITED.**—No indecent or immoral picture, print, or representation shall be contained in, attached to, or stamped, marked, written, or printed on any package of cannabis products.

“(e) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary, cannabis products may be exempted from subsections (a) and (b) if such products are—

“(1) for experimental purposes, or

“(2) transferred to the bonded premises of another producer or export warehouse proprietor or released in bond from customs custody for delivery to a producer.

“**SEC. 5933. PURCHASE, RECEIPT, POSSESSION, OR SALE OF CANNABIS PRODUCTS AFTER REMOVAL.**

“(a) **RESTRICTION.**—No person shall—

“(1) with intent to defraud the United States, purchase, receive, possess, offer for sale, or sell or otherwise dispose of, after removal, any cannabis products—

“(A) upon which the tax has not been paid or determined in the manner and at the time prescribed by this chapter or regulations thereunder, or

“(B) which, after removal without payment of tax pursuant to section 5904(a), have been diverted from the applicable purpose or use specified in that section,

“(2) with intent to defraud the United States, purchase, receive, possess, offer for sale, or sell or otherwise dispose of, after removal, any cannabis products which are not put up in packages as required under section 5932 or which are put up in packages not bearing the marks, labels, and notices, as required under such section, or

“(3) otherwise than with intent to defraud the United States, purchase, receive, possess, offer for sale, or sell or otherwise dispose of, after removal, any cannabis products which are not put up in packages as required under section 5932 or which are put up in packages not bearing the marks, labels, and notices, as required under such section.

“(b) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) shall not prevent the sale or delivery of cannabis products directly to consumers from proper packages, nor apply to such articles when so sold or delivered.

“(c) **LIABILITY TO TAX.**—Any person who possesses cannabis products in violation of paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall be liable for a tax equal to the tax on such articles.

“**SEC. 5934. RESTRICTIONS RELATING TO MARKS, LABELS, NOTICES, AND PACKAGES.**

“No person shall, with intent to defraud the United States, destroy, obliterate, or detach any mark, label, or notice prescribed or authorized, by this chapter or regulations thereunder, to appear on, or be affixed to, any package of cannabis products before such package is emptied.

“**SEC. 5935. RESTRICTION ON IMPORTATION OF PREVIOUSLY EXPORTED CANNABIS PRODUCTS.**

“(a) **EXPORT LABELED CANNABIS PRODUCTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Cannabis products produced in the United States and labeled for exportation under this chapter—

“(A) may be transferred to or removed from the premises of a producer or an export warehouse proprietor only if such articles are being transferred or removed without tax in accordance with section 5904,

“(B) may be imported or brought into the United States, after their exportation, only if such articles either are eligible to be released from customs custody with the partial duty exemption provided in section 5904(d) or are returned to the original producer of such article as provided in section 5904(c), and

“(C) may not be sold or held for sale for domestic consumption in the United States unless such articles are removed from their export packaging and repackaged by the original producer into new packaging that does not contain an export label.

“(2) **ALTERATIONS BY PERSONS OTHER THAN ORIGINAL PRODUCER.**—This section shall apply to articles labeled for export even if the packaging or the appearance of such packaging to the consumer of such articles has been modified or altered by a person other than the original producer so as to remove or conceal or attempt to remove or conceal (including by the placement of a sticker over) any export label.

“(3) **EXPORTS INCLUDE SHIPMENTS TO PUERTO RICO.**—For purposes of this section, section 5904(d), section 5941, and such other provisions as the Secretary may specify by regulations, references to exportation shall be treated as including a reference to shipment to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

“(b) **EXPORT LABEL.**—For purposes of this section, an article is labeled for export or contains an export label if it bears the mark, label, or notice required under section 5904(b).

“**Subchapter E—Penalties**

“Sec. 5941. Civil penalties.

“Sec. 5942. Criminal penalties.

“**SEC. 5941. CIVIL PENALTIES.**

“(a) **OMITTING THINGS REQUIRED OR DOING THINGS FORBIDDEN.**—Whoever willfully omits, neglects, or refuses to comply with any duty imposed upon them by this chapter, or to do, or cause to be done, any of the things required by this chapter, or does anything prohibited by this chapter, shall in addition to any other penalty provided in this title, be liable to a penalty of \$10,000, to be recovered, with costs of suit, in a civil action, except where a penalty under subsection (b) or (c) or under section 6651 or 6653 or part II of subchapter A of chapter 68 may be collected from such person by assessment.

“(b) **FAILURE TO PAY TAX.**—Whoever fails to pay any tax imposed by this chapter at the time prescribed by law or regulations, shall, in addition to any other penalty provided in this title, be liable to a penalty of 10 percent of the tax due but unpaid.

“(c) **SALE OF CANNABIS OR CANNABIS PRODUCTS FOR EXPORT.**—

“(1) Every person who sells, relands, or receives within the jurisdiction of the United States any cannabis products which have been labeled or shipped for exportation under this chapter,

“(2) every person who sells or receives such relanded cannabis products, and

“(3) every person who aids or abets in such selling, relanding, or receiving, shall, in addition to the tax and any other penalty provided in this title, be liable for a penalty equal to the greater of \$10,000 or 10 times the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter. All cannabis products relanded within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be forfeited to the United States and destroyed. All vessels, vehicles, and aircraft used in such relanding or in removing such cannabis products from the place where relanded, shall be forfeited to the United States.

“(d) **APPLICABILITY OF SECTION 6665.**—The penalties imposed by subsections (b) and (c) shall be assessed, collected, and paid in the same manner as taxes, as provided in section 6665(a).

“(e) **CROSS REFERENCES.**—For penalty for failure to make deposits or for overstatement of deposits, see section 6656.

“**SEC. 5942. CRIMINAL PENALTIES.**

“(a) **FRAUDULENT OFFENSES.**—Whoever, with intent to defraud the United States—

“(1) engages in business as a cannabis enterprise without filing the application and obtaining the permit where required by this chapter or regulations thereunder,

“(2) fails to keep or make any record, return, report, or inventory, or keeps or makes any false or fraudulent record, return, report, or inventory, required by this chapter or regulations thereunder,

“(3) refuses to pay any tax imposed by this chapter, or attempts in any manner to evade or defeat the tax or the payment thereof,



“(4) sells or otherwise transfers, contrary to this chapter or regulations thereunder, any cannabis products subject to tax under this chapter, or

“(5) purchases, receives, or possesses, with intent to redistribute or resell, any cannabis product—

“(A) upon which the tax has not been paid or determined in the manner and at the time prescribed by this chapter or regulations thereunder, or

“(B) which, without payment of tax pursuant to section 5904, have been diverted from the applicable purpose or use specified in that section, shall, for each such offense, be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

“(b) **LIABILITY TO TAX.**—Any person who possesses cannabis products in violation of subsection (a) shall be liable for a tax equal to the tax on such articles.”.

(c) **STUDY.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary's delegate, shall—

(1) conduct a study concerning the characteristics of the cannabis industry, including the number of persons operating cannabis enterprises at each level of such industry, the volume of sales, the amount of tax collected each year, and the areas of evasion, and

(2) submit to Congress recommendations to improve the regulation of the industry and the administration of the related tax.

(d) **ANNUAL REPORTS REGARDING DETERMINATION OF APPLICABLE RATES.**—Not later than 6 months before the beginning of each calendar year to which section 5901(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section) applies, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary's delegate, shall make publicly available a detailed description of the methodology which the Secretary anticipates using to determine the applicable rate per ounce and the applicable rate per gram which will apply for such calendar year under section 5901(c)(2) of such Code.

(e) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Section 6103(o)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and firearms” and inserting “firearms, and cannabis products”.

(2) The table of chapters for subtitle E of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“CHAPTER 56. CANNABIS PRODUCTS”.

(3) The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 98 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 9512. Opportunity Trust Fund.”.

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to removals, and applications for permits under section 5922 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by subsection (b)), after 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUST FUND.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

## SEC. 6. OPPORTUNITY TRUST FUND PROGRAMS.

(a) **CANNABIS JUSTICE OFFICE; COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT GRANT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **CANNABIS JUSTICE OFFICE.**—Part A of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 109 the following:

### “SEC. 110. CANNABIS JUSTICE OFFICE.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established within the Office of Justice Programs a Cannabis Justice Office.

“(b) **DIRECTOR.**—The Cannabis Justice Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs. The Director

shall report to the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs. The Director shall award grants and may enter into compacts, cooperative agreements, and contracts on behalf of the Cannabis Justice Office. The Director may not engage in any employment other than that of serving as the Director, nor may the Director hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Office makes any contract or other arrangement.

“(c) **EMPLOYEES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall employ as many full-time employees as are needed to carry out the duties and functions of the Cannabis Justice Office under subsection (d). Such employees shall be exclusively assigned to the Cannabis Justice Office.

“(2) **INITIAL HIRES.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Director shall—

“(A) hire no less than one-third of the total number of employees of the Cannabis Justice Office; and

“(B) no more than one-half of the employees assigned to the Cannabis Justice Office by term appointment that may after 2 years be converted to career appointment.

“(3) **LEGAL COUNSEL.**—At least one employee hired for the Cannabis Justice Office shall serve as legal counsel to the Director and shall provide counsel to the Cannabis Justice Office.

“(d) **DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS.**—The Cannabis Justice Office is authorized to—

“(1) administer the Community Reinvestment Grant Program; and

“(2) perform such other functions as the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs may delegate, that are consistent with the statutory obligations of this section.”.

(2) **COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT GRANT PROGRAM.**—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

### “PART OO—COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT GRANT PROGRAM

#### “SEC. 3052. AUTHORIZATION.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Cannabis Justice Office shall establish and carry out a grant program, known as the ‘Community Reinvestment Grant Program’, to provide eligible entities with funds to administer services for individuals adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, including—

“(1) job training;

“(2) reentry services;

“(3) legal aid for civil and criminal cases, including expungement of cannabis convictions;

“(4) literacy programs;

“(5) youth recreation or mentoring programs; and

“(6) health education programs.

“(b) **SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER SERVICES.**—The Director, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall provide eligible entities with funds to administer substance use disorder services for individuals adversely impacted by the War on Drugs or connect patients with substance use disorder services. Also eligible for such services are individuals who have been arrested for or convicted of the sale, possession, use, manufacture, or cultivation of a controlled substance other than cannabis (except for a conviction involving distribution to a minor).

#### “SEC. 3053. FUNDING FROM OPPORTUNITY TRUST FUND.

“The Director shall carry out the program under this part using funds made available under section 9512(c)(1) and (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

#### “SEC. 3054. DEFINITIONS.

“In this part:

“(1) The term ‘cannabis conviction’ means a conviction, or adjudication of juvenile delinquency, for a cannabis offense (as such term is defined in section 13 of the Marijuana Oppor-

tunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2020).

“(2) The term ‘eligible entity’ means a non-profit organization, as defined in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, that is representative of a community or a significant segment of a community with experience in providing relevant services to individuals adversely impacted by the War on Drugs in that community.

“(3) The term ‘individuals adversely impacted by the War on Drugs’ has the meaning given that term in section 6 of the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2020”.

(b) **CANNABIS OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM; EQUITABLE LICENSING GRANT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **CANNABIS OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM.**—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall establish and carry out a program, to be known as the “Cannabis Opportunity Program” to provide any eligible State or locality funds to make loans under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 363(m)) to assist small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, as defined in section 8(d)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(3)(C)) that operate in the cannabis industry.

(2) **EQUITABLE LICENSING GRANT PROGRAM.**—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall establish and carry out a grant program, to be known as the “Equitable Licensing Grant Program”, to provide any eligible State or locality funds to develop and implement equitable cannabis licensing programs that minimize barriers to cannabis licensing and employment for individuals adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, provided that each grantee includes in its cannabis licensing program at least four of the following:

(A) A waiver of cannabis license application fees for individuals who have had an income below 250 percent of the Federal Poverty Level for at least 5 of the past 10 years who are first-time applicants.

(B) A prohibition on the denial of a cannabis license based on a conviction for a cannabis offense that took place prior to State legalization of cannabis or the date of enactment of this Act, as appropriate.

(C) A prohibition on criminal conviction restrictions for licensing except with respect to a conviction related to owning and operating a business.

(D) A prohibition on cannabis license holders engaging in suspicionless cannabis drug testing of their prospective or current employees, except with respect to drug testing for safety-sensitive positions under part 40 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

(E) The establishment of a cannabis licensing board that is reflective of the racial, ethnic, economic, and gender composition of the State or locality, to serve as an oversight body of the equitable licensing program.

(3) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) The term “individual adversely impacted by the War on Drugs” means an individual—

(i) who has had an income below 250 percent of the Federal Poverty Level for at least 5 of the past 10 years; and

(ii) has been arrested for or convicted of the sale, possession, use, manufacture, or cultivation of cannabis (except for a conviction involving distribution to a minor), or whose parent, sibling, spouse, or child has been arrested for or convicted of such an offense.

(B) The term “eligible State or locality” means a State or locality that has taken steps to—

(i) create an automatic process, at no cost to the individual, for the expungement, destruction, or sealing of criminal records for cannabis offenses; and

(ii) eliminate violations or other penalties for persons under parole, probation, pre-trial, or other State or local criminal supervision for a cannabis offense.

(C) The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, and any Indian Tribe (as defined in section 201 of Public Law 90–294 (25 U.S.C. 1301) (commonly known as the “Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968”)).

**SEC. 7. AVAILABILITY OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS AND SERVICES TO CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.**

(a) DEFINITIONS RELATING TO CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—Section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(ff) CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—In this Act:

“(1) CANNABIS.—The term ‘cannabis’—

“(A) means all parts of the plant *Cannabis sativa* L., whether growing or not; the seeds thereof; the resin extracted from any part of such plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such plant, its seeds or resin; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) hemp, as defined in section 297A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946;

“(ii) the mature stalks of such plant, fiber produced from such stalks, oil or cake made from the seeds of such plant, any other compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such mature stalks (except the resin extracted therefrom), fiber, oil, or cake, or the sterilized seed of such plant which is incapable of germination; or

“(iii) any drug product approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, or biological product licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act.

“(2) CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESS.—The term ‘cannabis-related legitimate business’ means a manufacturer, producer, or any person or company that is a small business concern and that—

“(A) engages in any activity described in subparagraph (B) pursuant to a law established by a State or a political subdivision of a State, as determined by such State or political subdivision; and

“(B) participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling cannabis or cannabis products, including cultivating, producing, manufacturing, selling, transporting, displaying, dispensing, distributing, or purchasing cannabis or cannabis products.

“(3) SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ‘service provider’—

“(A) means a business, organization, or other person that—

“(i) sells goods or services to a cannabis-related legitimate business; or

“(ii) provides any business services, including the sale or lease of real or any other property, legal or other licensed services, or any other ancillary service, relating to cannabis; and

“(B) does not include a business, organization, or other person that participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling cannabis or cannabis products, including cultivating, producing, manufacturing, selling, transporting, displaying, dispensing, distributing, or purchasing cannabis or cannabis products.”.

(b) SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.—Section 21(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) SERVICES FOR CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—A small business development center may not decline to provide services to an otherwise eligible small business concern under this section solely because such concern is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.”.

(c) WOMEN’S BUSINESS CENTERS.—Section 29 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656) is

amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(p) SERVICES FOR CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—A women’s business center may not decline to provide services to an otherwise eligible small business concern under this section solely because such concern is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.”.

(d) SCORE.—Section 8(b)(1)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The head of the SCORE program established under this subparagraph may not decline to provide services to an otherwise eligible small business concern solely because such concern is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.”.

(e) VETERAN BUSINESS OUTREACH CENTERS.—Section 32 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657b) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) SERVICES FOR CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—A Veteran Business Outreach Center may not decline to provide services to an otherwise eligible small business concern under this section solely because such concern is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.”.

(f) 7(A) LOANS.—Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(37) LOANS TO CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—The Administrator may not decline to provide a guarantee for a loan under this subsection to an otherwise eligible small business concern solely because such concern is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.”.

(g) DISASTER LOANS.—Section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (15) the following new paragraph:

“(16) ASSISTANCE TO CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—The Administrator may not decline to provide assistance under this subsection to an otherwise eligible borrower solely because such borrower is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.”.

(h) MICROLOANS.—Section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(14) ASSISTANCE TO CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—An eligible intermediary may not decline to provide assistance under this subsection to an otherwise eligible borrower solely because such borrower is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.”.

(i) STATE OR LOCAL DEVELOPMENT COMPANY LOANS.—Title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 695 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“SEC. 511. LOANS TO CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.**

“The Administrator may not decline to provide a guarantee for a loan under this title to an otherwise eligible State or local development company solely because such State or local development company provides financing to an entity that is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider (as defined in section 3(ff) of the Small Business Act).”.

**SEC. 8. NO DISCRIMINATION IN THE PROVISION OF A FEDERAL PUBLIC BENEFIT ON THE BASIS OF CANNABIS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—No person may be denied any Federal public benefit (as such term is defined in section 401(c) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1611(c))) on the basis of any use or possession of cannabis, or on the basis of a conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency for a cannabis offense, by that person.

(b) SECURITY CLEARANCES.—Federal agencies may not use past or present cannabis or mari-

juana use as criteria for granting, denying, or rescinding a security clearance.

**SEC. 9. NO ADVERSE EFFECT FOR PURPOSES OF THE IMMIGRATION LAWS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the immigration laws (as such term is defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act), cannabis may not be considered a controlled substance, and an alien may not be denied any benefit or protection under the immigration laws based on any event, including conduct, a finding, an admission, addiction or abuse, an arrest, a juvenile adjudication, or a conviction, relating to cannabis, regardless of whether the event occurred before, on, or after the effective date of this Act.

(b) CANNABIS DEFINED.—The term “cannabis”—

(1) means all parts of the plant *Cannabis sativa* L., whether growing or not; the seeds thereof; the resin extracted from any part of such plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such plant, its seeds or resin; and

(2) does not include—

(A) hemp, as defined in section 297A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946;

(B) the mature stalks of such plant, fiber produced from such stalks, oil or cake made from the seeds of such plant, any other compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such mature stalks (except the resin extracted therefrom), fiber, oil, or cake, or the sterilized seed of such plant which is incapable of germination; or

(C) any drug product approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, or biological product licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—The Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 212(h), by striking “and subparagraph (A)(i)(II) of such subsection insofar as it relates to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marijuana”; and

(2) in section 237(a)(2)(B)(i), by striking “other than a single offense involving possession for one’s own use of 30 grams or less of marijuana”; and

(3) in section 101(f)(3), by striking “(except as such paragraph relates to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marijuana)”;

(4) in section 244(c)(2)(A)(iii)(II) by striking “except for so much of such paragraph as relates to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marijuana”; and

(5) in section 245(h)(2)(B) by striking “(except for so much of such paragraph as related to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marijuana)”;

(6) in section 210(c)(2)(B)(ii)(III) by striking “, except for so much of such paragraph as relates to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marijuana”; and

(7) in section 245A(d)(2)(B)(ii)(II) by striking “, except for so much of such paragraph as relates to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marijuana”.

**SEC. 10. RESENTENCING AND EXPUNGEMENT.**

(a) EXPUNGEMENT OF NON-VIOLENT FEDERAL CANNABIS OFFENSE CONVICTIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS NOT UNDER A CRIMINAL JUSTICE SENTENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, each Federal district shall conduct a comprehensive review and issue an order expunging each conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency for a non-violent Federal cannabis offense entered by each Federal court in the district before the date of enactment of this Act and on or after May 1, 1971. Each Federal court shall also issue an order expunging any arrests associated with each expunged conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency.

(2) **NOTIFICATION.**—To the extent practicable, each Federal district shall notify each individual whose arrest, conviction, or adjudication of delinquency has been expunged pursuant to this subsection that their arrest, conviction, or adjudication of juvenile delinquency has been expunged, and the effect of such expungement.

(3) **RIGHT TO PETITION COURT FOR EXPUNGEMENT.**—At any point after the date of enactment of this Act, any individual with a prior conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency for a non-violent Federal cannabis offense, who is not under a criminal justice sentence, may file a motion for expungement. If the expungement of such a conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency is required pursuant to this Act, the court shall expunge the conviction or adjudication, and any associated arrests. If the individual is indigent, counsel shall be appointed to represent the individual in any proceedings under this subsection.

(4) **SEALED RECORD.**—The court shall seal all records related to a conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency that has been expunged under this subsection. Such records may only be made available by further order of the court.

(b) **SENTENCING REVIEW FOR INDIVIDUALS UNDER A CRIMINAL JUSTICE SENTENCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For any individual who is under a criminal justice sentence for a non-violent Federal cannabis offense, the court that imposed the sentence shall, on motion of the individual, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, the attorney for the Government, or the court, conduct a sentencing review hearing. If the individual is indigent, counsel shall be appointed to represent the individual in any sentencing review proceedings under this subsection.

(2) **POTENTIAL REDUCED RESENTENCING.**—After a sentencing hearing under paragraph (1), a court shall—

(A) expunge each conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency for a non-violent Federal cannabis offense entered by the court before the date of enactment of this Act, and any associated arrest;

(B) vacate the existing sentence or disposition of juvenile delinquency and, if applicable, impose any remaining sentence or disposition of juvenile delinquency on the individual as if this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, were in effect at the time the offense was committed; and

(C) order that all records related to a conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency that has been expunged or a sentence or disposition of juvenile delinquency that has been vacated under this Act be sealed and only be made available by further order of the court.

(c) **EFFECT OF EXPUNGEMENT.**—An individual who has had an arrest, a conviction, or juvenile delinquency adjudication expunged under this section—

(1) may treat the arrest, conviction, or adjudication as if it never occurred; and

(2) shall be immune from any civil or criminal penalties related to perjury, false swearing, or false statements, for a failure to disclose such arrest, conviction, or adjudication.

(d) **EXCEPTION.**—An individual who at sentencing received an aggravating role adjustment pursuant to United States Sentencing Guideline 3B1.1(a) in relation to a Federal cannabis offense conviction shall not be eligible for expungement of that Federal cannabis offense conviction under this section.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “Federal cannabis offense” means an offense that is no longer punishable pursuant to this Act or the amendments made under this Act.

(2) The term “expunge” means, with respect to an arrest, a conviction, or a juvenile delinquency adjudication, the removal of the record of such arrest, conviction, or adjudication from each official index or public record.

(3) The term “under a criminal justice sentence” means, with respect to an individual,

that the individual is serving a term of probation, parole, supervised release, imprisonment, official detention, pre-release custody, or work release, pursuant to a sentence or disposition of juvenile delinquency imposed on or after the effective date of the Controlled Substances Act (May 1, 1971).

(f) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall conduct a demographic study of individuals convicted of a Federal cannabis offense. Such study shall include information about the age, race, ethnicity, sex, and gender identity of those individuals, the type of community such users dwell in, and such other demographic information as the Comptroller General determines should be included.

(g) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to Congress the results of the study conducted under subsection (f).

#### **SEC. 11. REFERENCES IN EXISTING LAW TO MARIJUANA OR MARIHUANA.**

Wherever, in the statutes of the United States or in the rulings, regulations, or interpretations of various administrative bureaus and agencies of the United States—

(1) there appears or may appear the term “marihuana” or “marijuana”, that term shall be struck and the term “cannabis” shall be inserted; and

(2) there appears or may appear the term “Marihuana” or “Marijuana”, that term shall be struck and the term “Cannabis” shall be inserted.

#### **SEC. 12. SEVERABILITY.**

If any provision of this Act or an amendment made by this Act, or any application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of this Act and the amendments made by this Act to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

#### **SEC. 13. CANNABIS OFFENSE DEFINED.**

For purposes of this Act, the term “cannabis offense” means a criminal offense related to cannabis—

(1) that, under Federal law, is no longer punishable pursuant to this Act or the amendments made under this Act; or

(2) that, under State law, is no longer an offense or that was designated a lesser offense or for which the penalty was reduced under State law pursuant to or following the adoption of a State law authorizing the sale or use of cannabis.

#### **SEC. 14. RULEMAKING.**

Unless otherwise provided in this Act, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Justice, and the Small Business Administration shall issue or amend any rules, standard operating procedures, and other legal or policy guidance necessary to carry out implementation of this Act. After the 1-year period, any publicly issued sub-regulatory guidance, including any compliance guides, manuals, advisories and notices, may not be issued without 60-day notice to appropriate congressional committees. Notice shall include a description and justification for additional guidance.

#### **SEC. 15. SOCIETAL IMPACT OF MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION STUDY.**

The Comptroller General of the United States shall, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, provide to Congress a study that addresses the societal impact of the legalization of recreational cannabis by States, including—

(1) sick days reported to employers;

(2) workers compensation claims;

(3) tax revenue remitted to States resulting from legal marijuana sales;

(4) changes in government spending related to enforcement actions and court proceedings;

(5) Federal welfare assistance applications;

(6) rate of arrests related to methamphetamine possession;

(7) hospitalization rates related to methamphetamine and narcotics use;

(8) uses of marijuana and its byproducts for medical purposes;

(9) uses of marijuana and its byproducts for purposes relating to the health, including the mental health, of veterans;

(10) arrest rates of individuals driving under the influence or driving while intoxicated by marijuana;

(11) traffic-related deaths and injuries where the driver is impaired by marijuana;

(12) arrest of minors for marijuana-related charges;

(13) violent crime rates;

(14) school suspensions, expulsions, and law enforcement referrals that are marijuana-related;

(15) high school dropout rates;

(16) changes in district-wide and State-wide standardized test scores;

(17) marijuana-related hospital admissions and poison control calls;

(18) marijuana-related juvenile admittances into substance rehabilitation facilities and mental health clinics;

(19) diversion of marijuana into neighboring States and drug seizures in neighboring States;

(20) marijuana plants grown on public lands in contravention to Federal and State laws; and

(21) court filings under a State's organized crime statutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate and find relief in the opportunity to speak on behalf of H.R. 3884, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2020, or the MORE Act of 2020.

I have great determination for the American people who, with a majority of Democrats and Republicans, understand the importance of the MORE Act, and I believe it is important to pass a long overdue measure, and I encourage the rest of my colleagues to do so as well.

I don't rise today to promote drug use. I don't rise today to harm those young people who are in the beginning of their life.

I do not rise today to undermine law enforcement. In fact, in speaking to a representative of the law enforcement community, detailing this legislation, there was a great relief and understanding of the fairness and the justice that would be rendered with the passage of the MORE Act.

It has taken us a long time to get here, and I would like to take the opportunity to thank all of those who have made it possible for us to consider this bill today; in particular, my colleague, our chairman on the House Judiciary Committee, the author of this

bill, Chairman JERRY NADLER. He has worked without ceasing on this legislation, as well as two very determined colleagues who have continued their advocacy, and they were particularly instrumental in getting us here, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER.

To summarize the provisions of the MORE Act, they fall into two categories: First, simply, it would remove marijuana or cannabis from the list or schedule of Federally controlled substances. This means that, going forward, individuals could no longer be prosecuted federally for marijuana offenses.

This does not mean that marijuana would now be legal in the entire United States, as some have tried to argue. It would simply remove the Federal Government from interfering with State laws and State structures in the business of prosecuting marijuana cases and would leave the question of legality to the individual States.

Those States choosing to decriminalize can do so without ongoing interference from the Federal Government; and those States that choose to continue to make marijuana illegal can continue to do so as well.

Second, the bill would establish a taxation structured to collect a sales tax on marijuana which, over the course of 5 years, could increase from 5 to 8 percent. The funds collected through this tax will be used to establish a trust to do good, to reinvest in communities ravaged by the war on drugs. I know it firsthand, by living and growing up in those communities, those communities of color and those communities beyond.

What I would also say is it would bring banking a relief. Businesses who ultimately will come from this legislation, legally, will have the legal right and opportunity to secure legal banking relationships. The trust fund will be used for rehabilitation and re-entry programs in the Department of Justice and for programs in the Small Business Administration to ensure that the growing marijuana market is diverse and opens up opportunities for entrepreneurship in communities that have been adversely impacted by the war on drugs.

In the last week, in my community, a bright, young individual was killed because of marijuana, marijuana sales. A bright light, yes, was extinguished in a minute with violence. This is what we want to see eliminated. We want a government structure that saves lives.

Finally, the bill would expunge and seal Federal marijuana arrests and convictions and resentenced offenders as appropriate, a much-needed measure to try to undo the damage that has been done to our communities since marijuana was arbitrarily placed on the list of controlled substances back in 1970.

The numbers are staggering but, most of all, the numbers are staggering with the imbalance of prosecution of African Americans and people of

Latinx heritage, Hispanic heritage. What an imbalance. What a massive infusion of incarceration across this Nation.

Thousands of men and women have suffered needlessly from the Federal criminalization of marijuana, particularly in communities of color, and have born the burden of collateral consequences for those ensnared in the criminal legal system that have damaged our society across generations. This is unacceptable, and we must change our laws.

It is time for Congress to catch up with the reforms that States have enacted. It is time for Congress to catch up with Americans. Thirty-six States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam have adopted laws allowing legal access to cannabis. Fifteen States, the District of Columbia, and the Northern Mariana Islands have adopted laws legalizing cannabis for adult recreational use.

A total of 47 States have reformed their laws in one form or another pertaining to cannabis, despite its Federal criminalization.

The State legal cannabis industry already employs almost a quarter of a million people, and the Federal Government needs to get out of the way of State-level decisionmaking for their citizens.

We need to open the door to research, better banking, and tax laws. We need to help fuel economic growth in this industry. We need to save lives. We need to help young people. We need to bring our Nation together.

And we need to do this without continuing to spend Federal resources on criminalization and unjust incarceration for marijuana offenses.

We need to pass the MORE Act.

That is why I support it, and that is why I believe it is important for us to unify and support this bill today. And I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the legislation and a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, and its Subcommittee on Crime, Homeland Security, and Terrorism, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3884, the "Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2020," or "MORE Act of 2020."

I support this legislation because it accomplishes three very important things.

First, it removes marijuana, or cannabis, from the list—or the schedule—of Federally controlled substances.

This means that, going forward, individuals could no longer be prosecuted, federally, for marijuana offenses.

To be clear, this does not mean that marijuana would now be legal in the entire United States—it would simply remove the Federal government from the business of prosecuting marijuana cases and would leave the question of legality to the individual States.

States choosing to decriminalize can do so, without ongoing interference from the Federal government, and those states that choose to continue to make marijuana illegal can continue to do so, as well.

Second, the bill sets up a taxation structure to collect a sales tax on marijuana, which,

over the course of five years would increase from five to eight percent.

The funds collected through this tax will be used to establish a trust fund to reinvest in communities ravaged by the War on Drugs and in communities of color.

The trust fund will be used for rehabilitation and reentry programs in the Department of Justice and for programs in the Small Business Administration to ensure that the burgeoning marijuana market is diverse and opens up opportunities for entrepreneurship in communities that have been adversely impacted by the War on Drugs.

Finally, the bill would expunge and seal Federal marijuana convictions and resentenced offenders, as appropriate—a much-needed measure to try to undo the damage that has been done to our communities since marijuana was arbitrarily placed on the list of controlled substances, back in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of men and women have suffered needlessly from the federal criminalization of marijuana, particularly in communities of color, and have born the burden of the collateral consequences for those ensnared in the criminal legal system that have damaged our society across generations.

The racially disproportionate prosecution of marijuana offenses is, in fact, a real problem at the federal level, and is not just a problem at the state and local level.

Data from the U.S. Sentencing Commission proves the prosecution of cannabis offenses at the federal level disproportionately affects minority communities.

According to the U.S. Sentencing Commission, about 84 percent of the more than 2,000 marijuana offenders who were federally sentenced in 2018 were people of color.

Only 11 percent were white, even though more than 60 percent of the U.S. population is white.

This is unacceptable and we must change our laws.

It is time for Congress to catch up with the times and the reforms that states are enacting.

Thirty-six states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam have adopted laws allowing legal access to cannabis.

Fifteen states, the District of Columbia, and the Northern Mariana Islands have adopted laws for legalizing cannabis for adult recreational use.

A total of 47 States have reformed their laws in one form or another pertaining to cannabis, despite its Federal criminalization.

Mr. Speaker, the State legal-cannabis industry already employs almost a quarter of a million people and the federal government needs to get out of the way of state-level decision making for their citizens.

We need to open the door to research, better banking and tax laws, and we need to help fuel economic growth in this industry.

And we need to do this without continuing to spend federal resources on criminalization and unjust incarceration for marijuana offenses.

In short, Congress needs to pass the MORE Act.

Mr. Speaker, I will address briefly why certain objections raised against the bill lack merit and should be disregarded.

Some opponents propose merely re-scheduling marijuana (instead of descheduling it completely).

I oppose rescheduling marijuana to a lower schedule, such as Schedule III, because that

would only benefit industry, as cannabis-related businesses could start receiving tax breaks that would be prohibited if cannabis remained scheduled under Schedules I or II.

Rescheduling marijuana would do absolutely nothing to address the problem of enforcement of marijuana laws.

The Controlled Substances Act does not distinguish among the different schedules for purposes of enforcement and this amendment does not even touch the penalties associated with marijuana—including draconian mandatory minimums.

Keeping marijuana on the schedule of controlled substances at all will only continue to exacerbate disparities in the criminal justice system and further entrench the issues currently presented by federal marijuana prohibition, VA doctors will continue to be prohibited from prescribing medical marijuana for suffering veterans, and federal employees will still be subjected to random workplace drug testing for off-the-job marijuana consumption.

Next, let me address the misconception that decriminalization of marijuana at the federal level will lead to an increase in crime.

In fact, there is every reason to believe it would be the exact opposite.

Studies show that:

1. Laws allowing adult use of marijuana are not associated with an uptick in overall criminal activity.

2. Medical cannabis regulatory laws are not associated with an uptick in overall criminal activity.

3. Retail cannabis facilities are not positively associated with increased criminality and may play a role in the prevention of certain crimes such as larceny.

There is no need to anticipate that federal descheduling of marijuana will lead to more crime; states will still be allowed to leave in place their criminal laws and regulations related to marijuana, if they desire.

Mr. Speaker, what is now largely a cash business will finally have access to banking, which will reduce the potential that lawfully compliant businesses become targets for crime.

In fact, for this very reason, decriminalizing marijuana at the federal level will enhance public safety.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, veterans consume marijuana at rates far higher than the general population, and many vets report substituting alcohol and prescription drugs with medicinal marijuana.

Veterans often report using cannabis to treat symptoms of chronic pain and mood disorders, like post-traumatic stress. In fact, marijuana used for medical purposes can help veterans ease their reliance on prescription and non-prescription opioids for pain relief.

And the clinical data support the use of cannabis treatment for these indications. Descheduling will allow VA doctors to prescribe marijuana without fear of punishment, and it will allow the choice to be with doctors and patients, where it belongs.

Descheduling marijuana, as this bill would do, will greatly benefit our veterans.

Let me discuss briefly the expungement provisions in the legislation.

The expungement provisions relate only to marijuana offenses, which are not per se violent offenses.

Punishment for other offenses committed simultaneously (or, for that matter, at any other time) would remain in place.

In the past several years, Congress has undertaken significant efforts to address the injustices inherent in our system of criminal justice.

Criminal justice reform has been a bipartisan pursuit.

Expungement is a critical component of any legislation seeking to address the disparities in our criminal justice system.

This is especially true in the context of marijuana arrests, prosecutions, and convictions, which disproportionately affect overcriminalized communities of color.

These are the communities that today continue to suffer most from the consequences of our failed drug policies.

There are two different kinds of expungement processes established by the MORE Act.

For those individuals who are in prison on a marijuana conviction or still under some form of federal court supervision, expungement takes place by way of resentencing, under the watch of a federal judge who will reevaluate whether, based on the person's conviction or convictions, it is appropriate to expunge or recalculate his or her sentence.

For those individuals who have completely finished serving their sentences and are no longer under court supervision, expungement would help give them a fresh start—again, consistent with the principles of criminal justice reform we have espoused in a bipartisan manner.

The collateral consequences suffered by those with marijuana convictions are numerous and vast and they are the direct result of the unfair and unwise placement of marijuana on Schedule I.

We can help undo the harm by expunging federal marijuana convictions in the manner set forth in the MORE Act.

Mr. Speaker, in voting to pass the MORE Act, this body will promoting public health and safety and delivering restorative justice.

I urge all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 3884, the “Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2020.”

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,  
Washington, DC, February 19, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 3884, the “Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019.” Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Small Business regarding the matters in H.R. 3884 that fall within the Committee's jurisdiction.

As a result of your consultation with us on this measure and in order to expeditiously move the bill to the floor, I forego further consideration of H.R. 3884. The Committee on Small Business takes this action with our mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our jurisdiction. Further, I request your support for the appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from the Committee on Small Business during any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming our understanding regarding H.R. 3884 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Committee Report and the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the measure. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ,  
Chairwoman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, July 13, 2020.

Hon. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ,  
Chairwoman, Committee on Small Business,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN VELÁZQUEZ: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 3884, the “Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019” (the “MORE Act of 2019”). You wrote me a letter concerning this legislation on February 19, 2020.

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 3884 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in H.R. 3884 which fall within your Committee's Rule X jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,  
Washington, DC, September 21, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 3884, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously on this bill, I am willing to waive this Committee's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Oversight and Reform does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name Members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective Committees.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,  
Chairwoman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, September 21, 2020.

Hon. CAROLYN B. MALONEY,  
*Chairwoman, Committee on Oversight and Reform,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN MALONEY: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 3884, the “Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019” (the “MORE Act of 2019”).

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Reform. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 3884 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in H.R. 3884 which fall within your Committee’s Rule X jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, November 17, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,  
*Chair, Committee on the Judiciary,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIR NADLER: In recognition of the goal of expediting consideration of H.R. 3884, the “Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019,” the Committee on Natural Resources agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to provisions that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The Committee on Natural Resources takes this action with the mutual understanding that, in doing so, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation.

Thank you for agreeing to include our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,  
*Chair, House Natural Resources Committee.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, November 18, 2020.

Hon. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,  
*Chairman Committee on Natural Resources,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 3884, the “Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019” (the “MORE Act of 2019”).

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 3884

and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in H.R. 3884 which fall within your Committee’s Rule X jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
Washington, DC, November 24, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD L. NADLER,  
*Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I write concerning H.R. 3884, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019. This bill was primarily referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and additionally to the Committee on Education and Labor. As a result of Leadership and the Committee on Judiciary having consulted with me concerning this bill generally, I agree to forgo formal consideration of the bill so the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee on Education and Labor takes this action with our mutual understanding that by forgoing formal consideration of H.R. 3884, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and we will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so we may address any remaining issues within our Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you support my request to name members of the Committee on Education and Labor to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Finally, I would appreciate a response confirming this understanding and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the committee report for H.R. 3884 or in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. “BOBBY” SCOTT,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, November 24, 2020.

Hon. BOBBY SCOTT,  
*Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 3884, the “Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019” (the “MORE Act of 2019”).

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 3884 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in H.R. 3884 which fall within your Committee’s Rule X jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with

you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,  
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, November 27, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,  
*Chairman, Committee on Judiciary,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: In recognition of the desire to expedite consideration of H.R. 3884, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019, the Committee on Ways and Means agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to provisions that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letter on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 3884.

Sincerely,

RICHARD E. NEAL,  
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, November 30, 2020.

Hon. RICHARD NEAL,  
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN NEAL: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 3884, the “Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019” (the “MORE Act of 2019”).

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 3884 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in H.R. 3884 which fall within your Committee’s Rule X jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, November 30, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,  
*Chair, Committee on Judiciary,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I write concerning H.R. 3884, the “Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019,” which was additionally referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

In recognition of the desire to expedite consideration of H.R. 3884, the Committee on



Energy and Commerce agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to provisions that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The Committee takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. I also request that you support my request to name members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Finally, I would appreciate the inclusion of this letter into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 3884.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, JR.,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, December 1, 2020.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE, JR.,  
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN PALLONE: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 3884, the "Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019" (the "MORE Act of 2019").

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 3884 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in H.R. 3884 which fall within your Committee's Rule X jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,  
*Chairman.*

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the State of North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY), the good doctor.

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 3884, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act.

As a practicing physician for over 30 years, this bill deeply troubles me, especially with its researched implications for our youth population.

Marijuana is one of the most abused substances on this planet. And I will say, I am sympathetic to those who use marijuana for pain relief; I really am. It has been clinically proven to have activity in this area.

That said: A July 2020 study from the National Library of Medicine concluded that the THC component of cannabis can be the main culprit in psychosis and schizophrenia. A 2018 study from Duke University, in fact, showed a five-time increase in psychosis among chronic cannabis users.

The U.S. Surgeon General, Dr. Jerome Adams, agreed that there are se-

rious health risks associated with the use of marijuana in adolescence and in pregnancy.

The bill fails to set any standards to prevent marijuana, THC concentrates, vaping products, or edibles from getting into the hands of teenagers and young adults whose brains are still developing.

The MORE Act doesn't help prevent the distribution of marijuana to minors. It disrespects States' rights, fails to prevent violence and the use of firearms in growing and distributing marijuana and, lastly, it allows for the potential of marijuana revenue to fund criminal organizations, gangs, or cartels.

I have been to the border and have personally seen what smuggling operations this legislation might allow.

Yes, legalizing weed would create revenue from taxes, but at what cost? Do we then start legalizing cocaine?

Marijuana is a gateway drug; make no mistake about that. It undoubtedly leads to further and much more dangerous drug use.

And while I do believe that medical marijuana can have some activity in chronic pain or those with cancer, this bill simply goes way too far. I will vote against it on the House floor, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3884.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, marijuana is not a gateway drug. There is ample scientific evidence demonstrating that the use of marijuana does not cause the use of other illicit substances. And according to the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the majority of people who are marijuana users do not go on to use other, harder substances.

The bill does not have any provision to sell marijuana to children.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a distinguished member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the MORE Act. The war on drugs targeting communities of color, primarily, has resulted in the advent of the prison industrial complex that has fed on and consumed the lives of countless individuals and families. Too many Black and Brown children in our country have grown up without a parent because of government-sponsored crony capitalism which saw profits and policies that put people in prison rather than dealing with drug abuse as a public health issue.

The criminalization of marijuana was used to disenfranchise an entire generation of Black men and women. The MORE Act is an important step forward toward more enlightened policy. I am proud to vote in favor of this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The MORE Act is flawed. It uses cannabis policy to do a great deal of social engineering to create new taxes and new programs and redistribution of assets.

But I am here as the only Republican cosponsor of the MORE Act, and I am voting for it because the Federal Government has lied to the people of this country about marijuana for a generation.

We have seen a generation, particularly of Black and Brown youth, locked up for offenses that should not have resulted in any incarceration whatsoever.

I am also deeply troubled by the current policy of the Federal Government that inhibits research into cannabis, research that could unlock cures and help people live better lives.

My Republican colleagues today will make a number of arguments against this bill, but those arguments are overwhelmingly losing with the American people. In every State where cannabis reform was on the ballot in this country, it passed. It passed with overwhelming support.

As a matter of fact, the only thing that I know that is more popular than getting out of the war on drugs is getting out of the war in Afghanistan. But if we were measuring the success in the war on drugs, it would be hard to conclude anything other than the fact that drugs have won because the American people do not support the policies of incarceration, limited research, limited choice, and particularly constraining medical application.

□ 0930

We are here in a time when many people in our country are suffering. They are in pain. It is documented that States with medical cannabis programs see a reduction in the prescribing of opioids and in the number of opioid abuses and deaths. We have held hearings in the House Judiciary Committee where people in our government must confess that this is, in fact, true, that the more we give people access to medical cannabis programs, the more we see a blunting of this horrible scourge of opioid addiction and opioid abuse.

We talk all the time on the right about the need to empower people and empower States. Right now, the Federal policy on cannabis constrains our people. It limits our States. I would only hope that in the 117th Congress, after this bill invariably dies in the Senate, we will actually come back and

pass the STATES Act because it acknowledges that we have screwed this up in the Federal Government.

While we have screwed it up, States have taken action. They have designed programs in the way that our great Federal system promises. If we were to pass the STATES Act, then best practices would emerge, States that developed applicable programs for their people would be replicable, and we would see better policies.

I am going to vote for the MORE Act. It won't pass the Senate and it won't become law, but then we should come back in the 117th Congress, and we should truly do more for our people.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from Florida for making this a bipartisan bill. I thank him for his insight, and I know that we will have many opportunities to work together.

I might add, if we pass the MORE Act, we will allow veterans, hospitals, and doctors to be engaged in research to help our returning soldiers and veterans who are suffering from a variety of diseases that may be impacted by marijuana use.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee and chair of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas for yielding.

The failed war on drugs first began almost 50 years ago, when Richard Nixon declared drug abuse public enemy number one. At the time there were less than 200,000 people incarcerated in America. Today, there are 2.3 million, disproportionately Black and Latino. Many of those who have been incarcerated over the years were imprisoned for nonviolent drug offenses, including possession of marijuana.

The United States incarcerates more people than any other country in the world. We have ruined lives, families, and communities. It is a stain on our democracy.

The possession of marijuana is done in equal, if not greater, numbers by White Americans when compared to Black Americans. Yet in community after community after community, Blacks and Latinos make up approximately 75 to 80 percent of the arrests and prosecutions.

How can that be?

Marijuana use is either socially acceptable behavior or it is criminal conduct, but it can't be socially acceptable behavior in some neighborhoods and criminal conduct in other neighborhoods when the dividing line is race. That is why we must pass the MORE Act, decriminalize marijuana in America, and bring to light the principle of liberty and justice for all.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was all over the State of Ohio in the recent campaign. I was all over the country. I was in Georgia, Florida, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and Texas, all over the place. Not once—not once—did an American citizen come up to me and say: Do you know what? The first thing I hope the Congress does after this election, the first major piece of legislation I hope the Congress takes up after this election is to legalize marijuana.

Not once did that happen.

But this bill does more than that. This bill says it is not enough just to legalize marijuana. They want taxpayers to pay for it. This bill sets up a grant program. This is the marijuana business infrastructure bill. It sets up an office in the Department of Justice—a special office in the Department of Justice—for the marijuana industry. Grant dollars, taxpayer dollars are going to this industry.

I didn't have anyone tell me: Do you know what? I hope the first big bill the Democrats do after this session is to give my tax dollars to the marijuana industry.

That is exactly what has happened here. But, frankly, this shouldn't surprise us. Think about what the Democrats did earlier this week. Their first big hearing—actually, their first hearing—since the election in the Judiciary Committee was Wednesday in the Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee. It was a hearing about letting criminals out of prison early because of the COVID issue—letting criminals out early in an environment where violent crime is increasing.

We know that, this summer, aggravated assaults are up 14 percent and homicides are up 53 percent. Democrat mayors and city councils around the country in our major urban areas in that environment are defunding the police. So in that overall environment where homicides are up, aggravated assaults are up, and there are less cops on the street, they want to release criminals early.

I want to read from a letter that Mr. NADLER and Congresswoman BASS sent to the Attorney General back in March:

We urge you to use every tool at your disposal to release as many prisoners as possible to protect from COVID-19.

They go on to further to state—and this is the part that is scary:

What you do with individuals who are high risk of contracting COVID-19, who are not in low- or minimum-security facilities, who have been convicted of serious offenses, we urge you to consider that even these individuals in these categories be assessed for release.

Mr. Speaker, so even the most violent criminals they were looking at and they were encouraging the Attorney General to release on our streets.

Oh, and just like with this marijuana bill, they want your tax dollars to pay for a grant program to the States to release criminals early—even the most

violent criminals. In an environment where violent crime is up, where our Democrat mayors are defunding their police and taking cops off the street, they want to release criminals early and, oh, your tax dollars pay for it. Mr. Speaker, that is what they want to do.

Now they say: Oh, by the way, it is not just enough that your tax dollars go to States to release criminals early in that environment when they are defunding the police and violent crime is up, we also want you to pay for the marijuana industry.

You have got to be kidding me, Mr. Speaker. You have got to be kidding me. They started the week off having a hearing on paying States to release criminals out of our jails, and now they are going to end the week by saying that taxpayers pay for the marijuana industry.

This is crazy. This is exactly what they want to do. Think about this for a second, Mr. Speaker. Think about a small business owner. Let's just pick Portland. A small business owner in Portland, who paid their local taxes, who this summer had their business destroyed because Democrat leaders in that city would not protect their business, now Democrats in Congress are saying: Oh, we want your Federal tax dollars to be used to release criminals early and to buttress the marijuana industry.

Such a deal for the taxpayer. That is what the Democrats have prioritized this week in the United States Congress. It is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting my good friend has been in different places than we have been in the House Judiciary Committee, but he remains my good friend.

Obviously, our hearing this week was on the devastation of COVID-19 in the Nation's Federal prisons, lives that are lost and lives that could be lost if strong structures are not put in place. That is our job.

I think the other point that should be made is that we will be made safer by this legislation. I can't explain to him the life that I have led, the neighborhood that I lived in, the amazing loss of young lives over marijuana because it was illegal. As we watched not only the life lost in bloodshed, but the life lost in incarceration—imbalanced incarceration, huge sentences—the loss of opportunity, of college, of housing, and of jobs.

We are crying out for relief. Interestingly enough, two out of three Americans say marijuana should be legal, including a majority of both Democrats and Republicans.

Finally, the taxation is on those who use marijuana. It is not on the small business person, it is on those who use and buy marijuana. So I hope that we can move forward on what the American people want us to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), who is a distinguished member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, wars are costly, and the war on marijuana is no exception. This war has derailed lives. It has led to lost jobs and housing. It has torn families apart. The cost of the war on marijuana has disproportionately fallen on the backs of Blacks and Latino people.

As White entrepreneurs across the country support their families by running businesses selling marijuana, many Black and Latino people are spending time behind bars and criminalized for doing the same.

In Rhode Island, a Black person was 3.3 times more likely to be arrested for possessing marijuana than a White person in 2018, even though Black and White people use marijuana at similar rates.

Immigrants have been deported simply for using marijuana in States that permit its use and despite never being convicted of a crime.

Targeting low-level marijuana-related offenders with harsh penalties has done little to make our communities safer. The MORE Act ends the criminalization of marijuana. It protects the 36 States, including Rhode Island, that have led the way on marijuana policy and legalized it for medicinal purposes.

People convicted of marijuana-related charges are often denied access to social programs or even the ability to take out student loans to further their education and careers. The MORE Act helps fix that.

This legislation redirects resources away from prosecution of marijuana and toward community investments and public health solutions. It establishes an opportunity trust fund that provides resources for those who have marijuana-related convictions, including job training and substance abuse treatment. It moves us closer toward racial equity by allowing expungement of nonviolent marijuana convictions.

The MORE Act provides restorative justice by providing SBA loans to assist small businesses, especially small businesses controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged people.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for his leadership and for introducing the MORE Act. I am proud to be a cosponsor, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this historic legislation.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just point out the American Medical Association put out a letter 2 days ago saying they oppose this legislation for the reasons that Dr. Murphy highlighted in his opening remarks.

I would also just, again, point out what the Democrats on the Judiciary Committee did on Wednesday. It was about releasing criminals from prisons early.

Again, just to read from the letter that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee sent to the Attorney General of the United States on March 30, 2020, he says. . . . who have been convicted of serious offenses or who have high pattern risk scores, we urge you to consider that even these individuals in these categories be assessed for release.

I don't know how you can say it any plainer, Mr. Speaker. These are some of the most dangerous people in our Federal prison system. They wanted the Attorney General to look at releasing them into the public. That is how they started the week. They are going to end the week by decriminalizing marijuana and giving American tax dollars to businessowners to further the marijuana industry.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Texas' comment that the MORE Act would make us safer calls for a specific response.

As Representative JORDAN just said, the fact that the MORE Act is on the floor at this time epitomizes Democrats' misplaced priorities. But it also puts on display their inclination to reckless disregard of consequences.

Just like the clarion call to defund the police, followed rapidly by astonished surprise over the ensuing surge in violence, Democrats' rush to legalize marijuana without any heed or response to the rising epidemic of drug driving across the country would mean more dead and injured Americans on our highways.

Consider this: since 2013, in Washington State, the number of fatal crash drivers who tested positive for THC has more than doubled. In Vermont, since 2010, fatal crashes linked to marijuana use have skyrocketed by 173 percent following that State's decriminalization. Forty-seven percent of Oregonians who died in a car crash in 2018 tested positive for marijuana, according to the Oregon State Police. More Indiana drivers in deadly car crashes test positive for drugs than for alcohol.

The data is clear: when governments liberalize marijuana laws, motorists and passengers die.

□ 0945

Law enforcement tells us they lack a reliable roadside test to detect marijuana use or a uniform standard to measure marijuana toxicity, yet our defund-the-police Democrat colleagues rush to change the status quo across the entire country while refusing even to consider my commonsense amendment that would require the Department of Transportation to develop and prescribe best practices for testing drivers suspected of marijuana impairment.

My amendment would help law enforcement keep people safe, but Demo-

crats would rather prioritize criminals. A North Carolina sheriff recently called drug driving "one of the leading killers in our State." Just like Democrats' efforts to defund police, the MORE Act's unintended consequences will include increased danger for our families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Americans' safety by voting against this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas has 17 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 17 minutes remaining, also.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me indicate that this legislation does not take away any of the responsibilities of the Department of Transportation in its regulatory authority, and the facts belie any worries regarding road safety.

According to a 2018 study of the National Bureau of Economic Research, States that have legalized marijuana have not experienced significantly different rates of marijuana- or alcohol-related traffic fatalities.

All of the State laws dealing with driving under the influence remain. Operating a motor vehicle under the influence of marijuana is still illegal in every State—we insist on that—and even in these States that have legalized the substance, and the MORE Act leaves these in place.

Mr. Speaker, we need to talk about the many deaths that have occurred because of the violence over illegal marijuana. I have seen it. We have seen it. We have lost lives in their future, and we have lost them to their families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for leading. I thank Chairman NADLER for his leadership in this issue and thank him, also, for including my amendment that calls for a study of cannabis as an alternative medicine for our veterans.

More than half of all Americans live in a State where cannabis is legal. Let's align Federal cannabis laws with the will of the people.

And let's take full advantage of the medical benefits of cannabis. We know that medical cannabis is good for treating things such as seizures, glaucoma, chronic pain, and PTSD, and veterans prefer cannabis over opioids.

Let me repeat. Veterans prefer cannabis over opioids to treat the invisible wounds that they bring back from the battlefield.

Other nations, like Israel, export cannabis products. Let's unleash America's free enterprise system to take full advantage of the commercial benefits of cannabis.

Let's get busy and do the will of the people. Let's pass the MORE Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding. I will talk about what I view as a massive confusion in this bill.

We have heard arguments this morning, already, that States are regulating this, and I believe, ultimately, that is where this regulation, domestically, should be: within the States.

Mr. Speaker, this bill ostensibly de-regulating cannabis imposes a Federal tax, Federal agencies, Federal oversight. You are not de-federalizing marijuana; you are just changing the regulatory structure in which you control marijuana. That is interesting to me, and I find it very disingenuous in some ways.

Mr. Speaker, what it also does is it obviates Congress' constitutional obligation to manage or oversee interstate commerce. That is what this bill does. It obviates that, while you are throwing a Federal tax on all these folks.

That is a bit of a problem, but it goes to an enhanced problem. As long as we have the massive and growing social welfare state that we have today, we will incur whatever detriment comes from the criminalization, nationally, of marijuana.

We must, in my opinion, have a serious discussion on this and not a congeries, a bill that is a congeries, a mishmash of ideas and hopes instead of data-driven science.

As the gentleman from North Carolina just iterated to us, it is a problem. If you have prosecuted or defended—and I did both, and I defended for many years. My specialty, the area that I focused on, was drunk and drug driving cases. It is a problem, and it is exacerbated by the decriminalization and legitimization of marijuana use in the States.

This bill does not address that appropriately. This bill does not do anything more than provide a different mishmash of Federal laws over marijuana regulation.

I am hoping for a serious dialogue sometime about an issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have to just close by saying this. When I heard someone say that all the States that have passed this have done so overwhelmingly, Arizona rejected it three times before barely passing it this time—barely passing it this time—and that is an election that is being contested even right now in the courts.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would hope my good friend would not be in opposition to the ability for there to be research on the use of marijuana, as well substance abuse, and as well to provide a healing and a restoration of these broken communities that have suffered the plague of marijuana arrests, incarceration, and prosecution. That is what we are doing in the MORE Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3884, the MORE Act.

Since the war on drugs began, the Nation's prison population increased from 300,000 to a staggering 2.2 million people behind bars. In the decade between 2001 and 2010, 8.2 million people were arrested on marijuana charges. Nearly 90 percent of those arrests were for simply having marijuana.

Most troubling is the fact that, despite equal use rates, Black Americans are four times more likely than White Americans to be arrested for marijuana.

People of color have disproportionately borne the burdens of these draconian policies, facing longer prison sentences and the lifetime economic consequences of having a criminal record. Generations of Black and Hispanic communities have suffered—families ripped apart, businesses shuttered, educations unfinished. This is neither law nor order; it is injustice.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity here to right our wrongs. The MORE Act is a sweeping effort for equity to our criminal justice system by removing marijuana from the Controlled Substances Act and requiring Federal courts to expunge prior convictions. The bill goes a long way to reduce racial disparities that plague our criminal justice system. Marijuana reform is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing the bill forward.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), a former police officer who has seen firsthand what drugs can do to individuals and to communities.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, Mike's Western Cafe, a family-run diner for 38 years, closed its doors in Duluth, Minnesota, for good on October 7.

On October 25, Waters of Superior, an art gallery and boutique, went out of business.

On the 27th of last month, Grandma's in the Park Bar and Grill, a local watering hole in Hibbing, Minnesota, was forced to call it quits.

And after 10 years in business, the Duluth Candy Company is closing up shop for good on December 31.

These are just a few stories of so many real people, real small business owners in my district who are losing their livelihoods due to effects of the COVID-19 closures. Yet here we are today, with mere days left in the year to get something done for the American people who are suffering, and Speaker PELOSI has brought up a drug legalization bill as mom-and-pop shops close for good, as families remain uncertain where their next paycheck is coming from, as children struggle to receive their education, and as childcare facilities close. As seniors remain isolated from their families, this is their solution: a drug legalization bill.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle like to point out that they have passed the Heroes Act, so they claim they have done their part. The Heroes Act was filled with so many partisan wish-list items that it was embarrassing.

In fact, Speaker PELOSI is so obsessed with pushing drug legalization efforts forward, she even puts provisions in the Heroes Act—if you can believe this—a new annual study on diversity and inclusion within the marijuana industry.

Come on, man. Families are losing their livelihood. People are hurting.

Mr. Speaker, Speaker PELOSI's answers to these families is: "It is out of our hands."

It is not out of our hands. We have the responsibility and opportunity to provide relief to the American people. We have the power to do better and work harder and be better than this.

It is time we think about the real needs of our constituents and get back to work on legislation that matters. Our priority should not be legalizing drugs or banning tigers; it must be bipartisan, targeted COVID-19 relief.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 11 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, you know what I am most—how should I say it?—honestly grateful for in the backdrop of Thanksgiving? That we had a Speaker of the House who never stopped negotiating and trying to find relief for the dying Americans and those suffering from COVID-19 with a major infusion of dollars almost 8 months ago. I am grateful for that.

I am grateful that we are now in the midst, if you will—late, but engaging—of negotiations, and that we are committed not to leave this place, not to go home for any holidays before we provide relief for the American people. I am grateful for that. That is going to happen.

So it is important to note that work is going on, led by our Speaker, and we hope that we will have the right partner to be able to save the lives of the American people who are now suffering from COVID-19. The MORE Act also saves lives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations and one of the strongest advocates for the MORE Act to save lives, to help young people.

□ 1000

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me reemphasize what the gentlewoman just said. I was so proud to vote for the Heroes Act twice nearly 8 months ago. I think that we have to move forward and continue to negotiate, and, hopefully, we will get some

votes on the other side of the aisle to help save lives and to help save businesses and to help our economic recovery. But I was proud to have voted for that twice already.

Thank you to Congresswoman JACKSON LEE for her tremendous leadership in bringing this bill to the floor, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act, the MORE Act. Let me thank Chairman NADLER and our fellow co-chair of the Cannabis Caucus, Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER, our respective staffs, and everyone for their effort, including the House Judiciary staff, for your hard work and for helping to bring this bill together to the floor.

Also, I have to call your attention to the advocates for their dedication to educating the public on this issue. This bill is an important racial justice measure. It is the product of years of work by so many activists and advocates and young people, and it is long overdue.

Yes, I have worked to end the war on drugs for many years. The MORE Act includes my legislation, the Marijuana Justice Act and the REFER Act, which are the first marijuana racial justice bills introduced in Congress.

This landmark legislation would end the Federal prohibition and decriminalize cannabis nationwide by removing it from the list of controlled substances, which is a major step, mind you, a major step toward ending the unjust war on drugs and racial inequities which are central to these laws.

This bill will facilitate expungement of low-level Federal cannabis convictions, create pathways for lucrative legal cannabis business ownership opportunities for communities of color, and provide critical resources for those most devastated by the war on drugs, for restorative justice to repair this damage.

I refer you to the letter by the chair of our Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RICHARD NEAL, and I would just like to read a portion of his statement as it relates to a Ways and Means tax issue, which Mr. BLUMENAUER is going to discuss a little further.

Mr. NEAL has addressed an issue that came to our attention as an exclusion in this measure and made a commitment, and he says that he looks forward to continuing to work with the measure's sponsors and other committees of jurisdiction to achieve an effective tax regime that supports a vibrant legal market and provides individuals most affected by this war on drugs the opportunity to fully participate in this emerging economy.

I want to thank the chair of the Ways and Means Committee for agreeing to help us fix several provisions of this important bill.

Make no mistake: This is a major racial justice bill. According to the ACLU, Black Americans are nearly four times more likely to be arrested for cannabis-related crimes than White Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, Black and Brown people are targeted more frequently than White Americans, despite equal rates of use.

Additionally, prison sentences for Black and Brown people are more likely to be lengthier than White people. Black men receive sentences over 13 percent longer than White men, and nearly 80 percent of people in Federal prisons for drug offenses are Black or Latino. So it is time to end these unjust laws which shatter the lives of so many young people of color.

I tell you, colleagues, we have got to give our young people a second chance. So please vote "yes" on this bill to help us move our unfinished business of liberty and justice for all forward. We have got to begin to really provide racial justice, crack these chains of systemic racism and this mass incarceration judicial system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was big cats. Today it is big cannabis. When is it time for real COVID relief? When is it time for us to help our constituents, our small businesses, our struggling and exhausted frontline workers, and teachers?

To legalize marijuana or not is one thing; to pass a bill that has no recourse for States that don't want mass legalization, which totals 35 states, is irresponsible. To not limit or regulate potency is carelessness. To not do anything to regulate advertising, which proved to be an issue with vaping when the industry targeted kids and teens, is negligent. To not provide funding for the FDA or USDA to manage the regulatory framework is reckless.

Take marijuana out of the scenario. None of us would support a reckless, negligent, careless, and irresponsible bill.

This flawed legislation is not time sensitive, does not require consideration this week, and should not take priority over the very serious and real issues facing our country.

There are real external threats facing our Nation. We should focus on strengthening America and not weakening it. There is a lot to be done before the end of the year, and Congress must be focused on rebuilding our economy and restoring our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), one of the determined and strong advocates for this legislation, a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I just heard my friend from Mississippi

talk about, you know, we shouldn't be dealing with things like this because the time is not right. His voters just approved medical marijuana, one of five States that approved it. Arizona didn't barely pass it; it was 60 percent.

We are not rushing to legalize marijuana; the American people have already done that. We are here because Congress has failed to deal with the disastrous war on drugs and do its part for the over 50 million regular marijuana users in every one of your districts.

We are here because we failed the parents of babies with extreme seizure disorders and why 10 States have stepped up, because the only thing that stops those babies from being tortured is medical cannabis. That is why 10 states have approved provisions like that.

We are here because Congress has failed to deal with our veterans, whose wounds, seen and unseen, will give them opioids, but we don't deal with giving them access to something, as Representative CORREA pointed out, dealing with medical cannabis, which is safer than the opioids we give them, and they suffer opioid deaths at a higher rate than the general population.

We are here because Congress has failed with research. We want to have a test for impairment. The 150,000 drivers for beer and wine wholesalers want to be able to test. But Congress has stood in the way of research. There is plenty of money; we don't have the authority to do it.

Speaking of small business, we are here because the Senate has failed to follow through on a \$17 billion industry that doesn't have access to financial services. It is an invitation to money laundering, to theft, to tax evasion, for an industry that is pitched by my friend's fellow Ohioan John Boehner, who is now a spokesman for the industry.

I have worked on this issue for 47 years. I, too, have traveled the country. I have never met an American who feels that this industry should pay its taxes with shopping bags full of \$20 bills.

We are here because we have failed our children. Children in each of your districts can get a joint easier than they can get a six-pack of beer, because no neighborhood drug dealer checks for ID. They don't have a license to lose. That is why we want to have a system that regulates, to protect our children. Right now, kids are not protected. They are victims to a black market that you allow to continue.

We are here because we have failed three generations of Black and Brown young people, whose lives can be ruined or lost by selective enforcement of these laws. This legislation will end that disaster.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to step up and do its part. We need to catch up with the rest of the American people.

I want to thank Stephanie Phillips, Tara Sulzen, Willie Smith, Julia Pomeroy, Amber Ray, Laura Thrift, Jason Little, David Skillman, people who have been working with me on this for a decade.

I am proud that we are at this moment, and I am proud that we are going to have an opportunity to approve the MORE Act and for Congress to step up and do its job so we catch up to your constituents.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the MORE Act, which legalizes marijuana across the United States.

As a mother and a former public schoolteacher, I am appalled at this legislation's disregard for the health and safety of our children, schools, and families. I am also shocked and appalled by the previous speaker's claim that this legislation is good for children and using children as an excuse to pass this bill and legalize it across this country.

The MORE Act would grant the marijuana industry unfettered access to our Nation's youth by allowing the sale of edibles and flavored marijuana vapes and permitting marijuana businesses to be located within 1,000 feet of schools, daycares, private kindergartens, public parks, and recreational facilities.

The bill also opens the floodgates for advertising high potency and extremely dangerous products on TV and social media, a place where our kids are spending countless hours every day.

We need to consider three critical points before voting today:

First, research has shown that people who use marijuana at a young age are more prone to addictive habits later in life as it activates the pleasure center receptors of the brain.

Second, long-term marijuana use has been linked by research to mental illness such as hallucinations, temporary paranoia, depression, suicidal thoughts, violent behavior, and schizophrenia.

And, third, these findings were serious enough to lead the U.S. Surgeon General to declare an advisory for marijuana use, emphasizing that: "Recent increases in access to marijuana and in its potency, along with misperceptions of safety of marijuana endanger our most precious resource, our Nation's youth."

The House should be discussing a responsible COVID relief package to aid the American people during the pandemic. Instead, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are focusing on legalizing marijuana. Where are our priorities?

The MORE Act completely undermines current research and health

warnings and puts our children in danger. I call on my colleagues to vote "no" on this irresponsible and dangerous bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that the aggressive enforcement of marijuana possession laws needlessly ensnares hundreds of thousands of people into the criminal justice system and wastes billions of taxpayer dollars. I can assure you that States are able to protect our children, which we will discuss in a later moment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the chairwoman of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation because it will restore justice to our most marginalized communities, and it will boost our economy.

I thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman NADLER, and my fellow chairs, for bringing this legislation to the floor today. The MORE Act takes meaningful action to address systemic injustices by removing cannabis from its current classification as a schedule I drug and incentivizing States to expunge low-level possession records.

As chair of the Small Business Committee, I am proud to have championed measures included in the bill that will expand capital access and Federal small business development resources to the cannabis sector.

We cannot forget that while communities of color have disproportionately suffered from the so-called war on drugs, they have also been locked out of traditional capital markets. That is why the MORE Act is the best legislation to advance progress on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes".

□ 1015

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, much of the debate we have heard today has been about criminal justice and the child safety implications of this bill. But I would like to focus on the troubling aspect of this bill in the tax title.

This bill would create a new Federal tax on marijuana, starting at 5 percent in the first year and escalating to 8 percent after 5 years. We always hear about tax parity in this Chamber, yet the treatment of these products compared to tobacco are vastly different—vastly different.

Let me say again, though, that this bill taxes marijuana, which has the potential to impact society really in unknown ways or at least in ways that we should all be concerned about, but at less than half the tax rate of a pack of cigarettes.

Once these taxes are created, rather than treating them as general revenue

where they could actually help defray the costs associated with the Department of the Treasury's newly created obligation to regulate marijuana growers, importers, and retailers, the bill would actually divert tax revenue into four brand-new government programs, including one to create subsidies for businesses.

This bill creates new criminal penalties for failure to pay the taxes. So, this isn't criminal justice reform. It is actually creating different types of penalties and criminalization and would likely lead to jail for small-time dealers for tax evasion instead of for selling their product.

Mr. Speaker, I don't support the underlying purposes of this bill, the legalization itself nationwide, but even if I did, I can't support the terribly flawed design, in terms of taxation, and the overall form of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting for months for Democrats to get serious about COVID relief, focusing on safely reopening our economy and helping folks who need it the most. Yet, here we are today, talking about a legalization bill yet again. This is a bad bill at the wrong time. I urge opposition.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the MORE Act, which allows the Federal Government to begin to catch up with the 47 States, like Illinois, which have already reformed their marijuana use laws in one way or the other.

Mass incarceration, which disproportionately affects Black and Brown citizens, has been aided and abetted by marijuana laws, which result in more than 600,000 arrests annually. The expungement provisions in this legislation will allow hundreds of thousands of individuals to get their records expunged so that they can more enthusiastically pursue legitimate jobs and work to take care of themselves and their families.

The MORE Act is an idea whose time has come. I urge that we vote "yes."

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the distinguished chair of the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the MORE Act. I applaud my colleagues,



Chairman NADLER and Vice President-elect HARRIS, for their leadership. It is past time that Congress answers the call for reform for low-level marijuana conviction justice.

This sweeping legislation would officially remove cannabis from the list of federally controlled harmful substances, protect medical cannabis businesses, and expunge low-level marijuana convictions that have disproportionately harmed people and communities of color.

The MORE Act would also help those whose convictions are overturned through an opportunity trust fund that would provide job training, reentry assistance, and legal aid. If we are serious about criminal justice reform, we need to get rid of the antiquated cannabis laws that disproportionately harm people of color. The MORE Act would do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, finally, this is a historic moment that so many here and across the country have been working toward, to take this step to end America's destructive and costly war on drugs that has turned everyday Americans into criminals and torn families apart, ruining so many people's lives.

This legislation removes cannabis from the Controlled Substances Act, frees States to regulate it as they choose, and encourages research into the medicinal qualities of this plant that we all already know are changing people's lives and saving people's lives. It also applies retroactively, expunging prior convictions and records, freeing a generation of people from the shackles of this failed war on drugs.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is this vote is about freedom. It is freedom of choice for every American to make their own decisions for themselves without fear of the government coming and arresting them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. The Senate should pass it quickly so we can send it to the President for his signature.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats started the week off with a hearing on letting criminals out of jail early. They end the week with a bill legalizing drugs. And they want the American taxpayers to pay for both programs.

They introduced a bill earlier in the year to give grant dollars to States to let criminals out of jail early, even violent ones, according to the letter Mr. NADLER and Chairwoman BASS sent to the Attorney General. Now, they want to create a trust fund in this bill to give grants to the marijuana industry and finance the marijuana industry.

Mr. Speaker, these are the actions the Democrats take, the first actions

they take after a national election. Go figure. Maybe that is why they lost 27 out of 27 toss-up seats around the country. Maybe that is why our party almost took back the majority.

That is what they choose to focus on at a time when you have Democrat leaders around the country defunding the police, locking down businesses, destroying small businesses all over our Nation. This is what they choose to focus on. This is what they choose to focus on.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me indicate very quickly that every 37 seconds, between 2001 and 2010, there were 8 million arrests, every 37 seconds, for marijuana. We spent \$3.6 billion on the war on marijuana, and it has not worked. We do today what saves lives.

We know that States are going to be able to continue to protect their children, and this does not undermine the ability of Congress to protect children as well. In every State that has legalized marijuana, they have developed a comprehensive set of regulations to protect consumers.

We also recognize that this issue of vaping is not generated by marijuana use. With a comprehensive structure, we will be able to protect children and not be selling marijuana to children. Those who have died in our communities may now live. As well, we will further understand the importance of a structure that is about restoration of justice. The imbalance against people of color has been a tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, the MORE Act is crucial to be able to pass, and I ask my colleagues to do so vigorously as we also fight COVID-19.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I would like to thank the following Members and committee and Member staff for their outstanding work on the MORE Act: Joe Graupensperger, Milagros Cisneros, Christine Leonard, BARBARA LEE, EARL BLUMENAUER, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, and FRANK PALLONE.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, today's House Consideration of the MORE Act marks an important step in mitigating the impacts of the historically racist war on drugs. This legislation will reform our federal criminal laws while also making investments in and empowering communities of color and those adversely affected by current unjust policies.

The MORE Act makes important changes to federal law by removing marijuana, or cannabis, from the list of federally controlled substances. This change to federal law does not undermine the ability of states to apply their criminal laws as they see fit. Instead it makes marijuana a federally regulated substance that is subject to the FDA's regulatory authority and federal taxation. The excise tax that is established by the bill is similar to those for alcohol and tobacco.

By creating a legal marijuana market that is subject to federal taxation, this legislation also

creates an opportunity trust fund that will increase opportunities for individuals and communities affected by the war on drugs. The opportunity trust fund will fund programs such as job training, reentry services, and substance abuse disorder services, as well as assistance to small businesses owned by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.

I thank my colleague, Representative BLUMENAUER, for his tireless leadership on this issue. As this bill continues through the legislative process, I look forward to continuing to work with the measure's sponsors and the other committees of jurisdiction to achieve an effective tax regime that supports a vibrant legal market and provides individuals most affected by the war on drugs the opportunity to fully participate in this emerging economy.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have introduced H.R. 3884, the "Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2020," or the "MORE Act of 2020."

This long overdue legislation would reverse the failed policy of criminalizing marijuana on the federal level and would take steps to address the heavy toll this policy has taken across the country, particularly on communities of color.

The MORE Act would make three important changes to federal law:

(1) remove marijuana, or cannabis, from the list of federally controlled substances;

(2) authorize the provision of resources, funded by an excise tax on marijuana, to address the needs of communities that have been seriously impacted by the War on Drugs, including increasing the participation of communities of color in the burgeoning cannabis market; and

(3) provide for the expungement of Federal marijuana convictions and arrests.

For far too long, we have treated marijuana as a criminal justice problem instead of as a matter of personal choice and public health. Whatever one's views are on the use of marijuana for recreational or medicinal use, the policy of arrests, prosecution, and incarceration at the Federal level has proven unwise and unjust.

This issue is not new to Congress. There have been many Members who have introduced bills upon which provisions in this bill are based. For instance, Representative BARBARA LEE has sponsored bills that are the foundation of key provisions of the MORE Act, and I thank her for her longstanding leadership on this issue. Representative EARL BLUMENAUER has also been an indefatigable advocate and has supported everything we have done to get to where we are today. I thank him, as well.

Federal action on this issue would follow the growing recognition in the states that the status quo is unacceptable. Despite the federal government's continuing criminalization of marijuana, 36 states and the District of Columbia have legalized medical cannabis. Fifteen states and the District of Columbia have legalized cannabis for adult recreational use.

I have long believed that the criminalization of marijuana has been a mistake, and the racially disparate enforcement of marijuana laws has only compounded this mistake, with serious consequences, particularly for communities of color.

Marijuana is one of the oldest agricultural commodities not grown for food, and it has

been used medicinally all over the world since at least 2700 B.C., but its criminalization is a relatively recent phenomenon.

The use of marijuana, which most likely originated in Asia, later spread to Europe, and made its way to the Americas when the Jamestown settlers brought it with them across the Atlantic. The cannabis plant has been widely grown in the United States and was used as a component in fabrics during the middle of the 19th century. During that time period, cannabis was also widely used as a treatment for a multitude of ailments, including muscle spasms, headaches, cramps, asthma, and diabetes.

It was only in the early part of the 20th century that marijuana began to be criminalized in the United States—mainly because of misinformation and hysteria, based at least in part on racially-biased stereotypes connecting marijuana use and people of color, particularly African-Americans and Latinos. In 1970, when President Nixon announced the War on Drugs and signed the Controlled Substances Act into law, the federal government placed marijuana on Schedule I, the most restrictive schedule that is attached to the most serious criminal penalties, where—unfairly and unjustifiably—it has remained ever since.

As a consequence of this decision, thousands of individuals—overwhelmingly people of color—have been subjected, by the federal government, to unjust prison sentences for marijuana offenses. It is time for this manifest injustice to end. The MORE Act would remove marijuana from Schedule I and the Controlled Substances Act altogether, thereby decriminalizing it at the Federal level.

This is only fair, particularly because the same racial animus motivating the enactment of marijuana laws also led to racially disproportionate enforcement of such laws, which has had a substantial, negative impact on communities of color. In fact, nationwide, the communities that have been most harmed by marijuana enforcement are benefitting the least from the legal marijuana marketplace.

The MORE Act would address some of these negative impacts, by establishing an Opportunity Trust Fund within the Department of Treasury to fund programs within the Department of Justice and the Small Business Administration to empower communities of color and those adversely impacted by the War on Drugs. These programs would provide services to individuals, including job training, reentry services and substance use disorder services; provide funds for loans to assist small businesses that are owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals; and provide resources for programs that minimize barriers to marijuana licensing and employment for individuals adversely impacted by the War on Drugs.

The collateral consequences of a conviction for marijuana possession—and even sometimes for a mere arrest—can be devastating. For those saddled with a criminal conviction, it can be difficult or impossible to vote, to obtain educational loans, to get a job, to maintain a professional license, to secure housing, to receive government assistance, or even to adopt a child.

These exclusions create an often-permanent second-class status for millions of Americans. This is unacceptable and counterproductive, especially in light of the disproportionate impact that enforcement of marijuana laws has

had on communities of color. The MORE Act recognizes this injustice and addresses these harmful effects by expunging and sealing federal convictions and arrests for marijuana offenses.

It is not surprising that over the past two decades, public support for legalizing marijuana has surged. In the most recent Pew Research Center poll—which was released at the end of 2019—67 percent of Americans now back marijuana legalization, up from 62 percent in Pew's 2018 poll. And just this November, there were ballot measures pertaining to marijuana in several states; they were all approved by voters. Indeed, the states have led the way—and continue to lead the way—on marijuana, but our federal laws have not kept pace with the obvious need for change. We need to catch up because the public supports reform and because it is the right thing to do.

In my view, applying criminal penalties, with their attendant collateral consequences for marijuana offenses is unjust and harmful to our society. The MORE Act comprehensively addresses this injustice, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill today.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2019 or the MORE Act. This landmark legislation is long overdue. It will deschedule marijuana, provide expungement for previous offenders, clarify that those previously convicted of marijuana related offenses would be eligible for federal benefits, and will establish an excise tax system on marijuana to invest in communities disproportionately affected by our failed marijuana policy.

I have been working on this issue since I was first elected to the Tennessee General Assembly in 1982. In this Congress, I have sponsored the CARERS Act to provide legal certainty for those using medicinal marijuana allowed under state law and the Fresh Start Act which provides a pathway for expungement for these types of offenses.

The history of marijuana as a Schedule-I drug is one full of bias and discrimination. This policy has served its racist purposes, targeting communities of color and disproportionately incarcerating people of color.

The War on Drugs has been a resounding failure, especially regarding cannabis. About 700,000 Americans each year are arrested for cannabis related offenses. Despite similar usage rates, there are nearly four Black Americans arrested for a cannabis-related offense for every white American. In my district, the situation is even worse. According to a 2013 ACLU study, in Shelby County, 83.2 percent of people arrested for cannabis offenses were Black, which the report cited as one of the highest county-level statistics in the nation. These arrests and convictions have long term impacts. Those with criminal records are limited from receiving federal benefits including SNAP, housing benefits, and Pell Grants. Our policy is exactly backward. We should be supporting those susceptible to substance abuse, not punishing them.

This bill rights an historic wrong and invests in the communities most harmed. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill. I thank Chairman NADLER for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this vote on the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement (MORE) Act of 2020 is a

historic moment for the millions of Americans caught in the tentacles of the failed “war on drugs”. In the midst of growing national dialogue on unjust law enforcement practices, the MORE Act first and foremost centers racial justice and comprehensively addresses cannabis prohibition. I am pleased that the MORE Act has remained a critical component of House Democrats’ plan for addressing systemic racism and advancing criminal justice reform. We owe it to the American people to pass this bill and I strongly support this legislation.

In 1970, Congress passed the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) to establish a comprehensive federal drug policy. As part of that bill, Congress placed a broad range of drugs among five Schedules, based on the relative harms of those drugs. Cannabis was placed—temporarily, it seemed—in Schedule I, while a commission studied the plant to make an informed recommendation about how it should be treated. Two years later, the commission recommended that marijuana be removed from Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act. However, for the past 50 years, that recommendation has been ignored, resulting in a decades-long war on cannabis that has damaged tens of millions of American lives.

This racially motivated policy has led to one of the most shameful episodes in criminal justice and race relations in America: the deliberate targeting of Black Americans for selective application of our cannabis laws. Too often, cases of low-level cannabis possession escalate to police violence, and Black Americans regularly face mistreatment at the hands of police because of cannabis.

More than 99 percent of the American population will soon live in a state where cannabis is legally accessible to some degree yet arrests for cannabis possession continue in huge numbers. In 2018, the highest number of arrests were for drug offenses, with cannabis arrests accounting for more drug arrests in the U.S. than any other drug class. At almost 700,000, police made more cannabis arrests than all violent crimes combined.

More concerning than the sheer number of arrests, is the racially biased enforcement of cannabis laws that is so evident in the stark disparity in arrest rates between Black and white people for cannabis possession. Despite similar rates of use, on average, Black people are almost four times more likely than white people to be arrested for marijuana. This difference can reach more than 20, 30, 40, or even 50 times at the county level.

People of color are often robbed of their dignity in perpetuity, because having a felony conviction can impact the ability to get an education, secure gainful employment, or vote. Ironically, as the emerging cannabis market blossoms, the cards are frequently stacked against the very people most victimized by the “war on drugs,” who now want to become entrepreneurs in the legal cannabis market. After centuries of systemic discrimination in housing, employment, and education, Black Americans are far less likely to have or be able to raise the kind of money needed to get involved in the legal market. Additionally, disproportionate arrest and conviction rates make it particularly difficult for people of color to enter the legal cannabis marketplace, as most states bar these individuals from participating. Minorities, and Black Americans specifically, are now largely missing out on the economic

opportunities created by legalization. Sadly, fewer than one-fifth of cannabis business owners identify as minorities and only approximately 4 percent are Black.

The American people have recognized the need to reverse this tragic mistake. A recent Gallup survey showed that more than two-thirds of Americans believe that cannabis should be legal. This groundswell of public support has translated into actual changes in state law. We now have 15 states, plus the District of Columbia, that have legalized cannabis for all adults. Moreover, there are 36 states in which medical cannabis laws allow patients to legally enjoy the benefits of the full spectrum of the cannabis plant. Some states and municipalities have taken proactive steps to mitigate inequalities in the legal cannabis marketplace and ensure equal participation in the emerging market.

The dichotomy between state and federal cannabis laws is the direct result of Congress ignoring the recommendations of experts nearly 50 years ago. The emperors who made and have kept cannabis illegal at the federal level were wearing no clothes—and the American people have called it out. We are now embarrassing ourselves by sitting by and doing nothing. This bill would not force states to make cannabis legal. If a state like Idaho wants to continue arresting people for cannabis, they will have that ability, as much as I may disagree with that decision. But by removing cannabis from the CSA, which is what this bill will do, we can remove this one tool of oppression. We can ensure that individuals who are acting in compliance with sensible state cannabis laws will not be in violation of federal law, while expanding cannabis research, broadening access to our veterans, and opening up banking opportunities.

No bill is perfect, and the MORE Act contains a provision that is contrary to our legislative intent. Without hesitation, I am committed to correcting this language to ensure that the millions of Americans, especially Black and Latino people, who have been most harmed by cannabis prohibition can participate equally in this emerging industry. Equity, inclusion and opportunity are fundamental values that must be at the center of all federal cannabis legislation. This is not the end of the story, it's the beginning of the next chapter. This is a fight for racial justice, economic justice, and freedom. This policy is long-overdue.

I have been working on this issue longer than any other politician in America, and I am thrilled that we are here today. I want to thank Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and her staff, Samira Damavandi and Gregory Adams, who have worked tirelessly to advance racial justice on this issue. I also want to thank the many advocates, businesses, and individuals who have helped us champion the end of cannabis prohibition. Lastly, I want to thank my team both past and present: Willie Smith, Laura Thrift, Amber Ray, Danielle Cohen, Sean Ryan, David Skillman, Stephanie Phillips, and Tara Sulzen.

This is a momentous moment and I am eager for the day this bill is signed into law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1244, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Lesko moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3884 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of section 3, the following:

(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Notwithstanding the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, an employer may test an employee or applicant for cannabis use to ensure workplace and public safety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic, House Democrats are rushing to pass a sweeping marijuana legalization bill without considering the unintended consequences the legislation will have on workplace and public safety.

According to the National Institute on Drug Abuse, studies have suggested specific links between marijuana use and adverse consequences in the workplace, such as increased risk for injuries or accidents.

According to the Federal Government's own workplace safety experts at the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, or NIOSH, other studies of cannabis use have demonstrated effects that include sedation, disorientation, impaired judgment, lack of concentration, and slowed fine motor skills. As my Democratic colleagues often say, we need to follow the science.

Currently, it is common practice for employers in industries such as construction and warehouse logistics to enact zero-tolerance drug policies that include a prohibition on marijuana usage to protect workers by ensuring a safe workplace and to comply with Federal law. Unlike on-demand evaluations of alcohol usage, there currently is no adequate real-time intoxication testing technology for marijuana impairment.

By removing marijuana from the list of scheduled substances in the Controlled Substance Act, the underlying bill will place unnecessary burdens on private employers and will needlessly jeopardize workplace and public safety and health.

For instance, the removal of marijuana from the CSA creates legal jeopardy for employers who are authorized under the Americans with Disabilities Act to test for illegal drug use while such authorization does not extend to legal drugs.

□ 1030

My motion to recommit adds specific language to the bill to affirm an employer's right to test job applicants and employees to ensure workplace and public safety.

Legalization of marijuana at the State level has already created complex challenges for employers wishing to maintain a drug-free workplace while abiding by relevant employment laws.

The bill before us today, which declassifies marijuana as an illegal drug, would only further complicate employers' compliance obligations and liability risks and reduce workplace safety around the country.

A last-minute Democrat amendment added to H.R. 3884 recognizes the right of the Federal Government to test its employees and workers in safety-sensitive positions covered by the Department of Transportation regulations, such as pilots and railroad operators. However, the bill omits the same protections for private-sector employers in other high-hazard industries not covered by DOT regulations.

If we adopt this motion, we will address legal ambiguities that may arise from removing marijuana from the Controlled Substances Act and affirm private employers' right to drug test employees in order to keep their workplaces and the public safe.

This is not a gotcha moment. It is not playing politics. My motion to recommit is a genuine attempt to improve the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I would call my distinguished friend from Arizona's attention—whose constituents just approved legalization with a 60 percent margin—to the Rules Committee Print, which includes new provisions to ensure that employees working in safety-sensitive transportation positions regulated by the Federal Government would still be tested for illegal or unauthorized use of alcohol, marijuana, or other substances.

Now, to be clear, no one wants to have people who are in these sensitive positions to be operating equipment, but there are several problems with the gentlewoman's position.

First and foremost, as I pointed out in the course of my presentation, because the Federal Government interferes with the research in cannabis, and has for 50 years, there is no good test for impairment.

Right now, I have heard from employers across the country, who are deeply concerned because as they test, and there is a trace of marijuana in the system, it continues for 30 days; long after there is any impairment. So we

are having people's jobs jeopardized because we haven't done the research that would allow us to have a good test.

The MORE Act, in the form that it is here, besides having the provisions that allow the testing to take place, would strip away the Federal Government interference with the research so that we can have a test that takes place.

It is important for employers to be able to have this test. Employers want to be able to deal with their employees fairly, and they don't have a good test now. So people are losing their jobs. They can't fill other jobs because applicants fail drug tests.

It is not that we don't test, the fact is we don't have a good test. And the Federal prohibition on research stands in the way of this. It is yet another example of the failed prohibition on cannabis and its unintended consequences. It prevents being able to make progress to be able to have effective tests and use them where they are needed.

My friends talk about people having traces of marijuana in their system in terms of driving stops. There is no indication that just because there is a trace that that impaired their operation. We don't have the tests.

That is why we need the MORE Act. That is why we need to reject the motion to recommit. Unless and until we do the research to be able to have effective tests to be able to deal with impairment, we are just chasing our tails. It doesn't solve the problem, and it avoids being able to take care of it.

I strongly urge rejecting this motion to recommit, passing the MORE Act so we can do the research, have the tests that employers and employees want and deserve so we get out of this never-never land of speculation and be able to actually tell the circumstances and give people a guidance to be able to get the result that I think we all want.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

#### NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION COMMISSIONED OFFICER CORPS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the mo-

tion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2981) to reauthorize and amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 265, nays 124, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

YEAS—265

Adams	Fortenberry	Lynch
Aguilar	Foster	Malinowski
Allred	Frankel	Maloney
Axne	Gabbard	Carolyn B.
Barragán	Gallagher	Maloney, Sean
Bass	Gallego	Matsui
Beatty	Garamendi	McAdams
Bera	Garcia (CA)	McBath
Beyer	Garcia (IL)	McCaul
Bilirakis	Garcia (TX)	McCollum
Bishop (GA)	Golden	McEachin
Blumenauer	Gomez	McGovern
Blunt Rochester	Gonzalez (OH)	McKinley
Bonamici	Gonzalez (TX)	McNerney
Boyle, Brendan	Gottheimer	Meeks
F.	Granger	Meng
Brindisi	Green, Al (TX)	Mfume
Brown (MD)	Grijalva	Moore
Brownley (CA)	Guest	Morelle
Buchanan	Haaland	Moulton
Bustos	Hall	Mucarsel-Powell
Butterfield	Harder (CA)	Murphy (FL)
Byrne	Hartzler	Nadler
Carbajal	Hastings	Napolitano
Cárdenas	Hayes	Neal
Carson (IN)	Heck	Neguse
Cartwright	Herrera Beutler	Norcross
Case	Higgins (NY)	O'Halleran
Casten (IL)	Himes	Ocasio-Cortez
Castor (FL)	Horn, Kendra S.	Omar
Castro (TX)	Horsford	Palazzo
Chu, Judy	Houlihan	Pallone
Ciulline	Hoyer	Panetta
Cisneros	Huffman	Pappas
Clark (MA)	Huizenga	Pascarell
Clarke (NY)	Hurd (TX)	Payne
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Clyburn	Jacobs	Peters
Cohen	Jayapal	Peterson
Cole	Jeffries	Phillips
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
Cooper	Johnson (TX)	Pocan
Correa	Joyce (OH)	Porter
Costa	Kaptur	Pressley
Courtney	Katko	Price (NC)
Cox (CA)	Keating	Quigley
Craig	Kelly (IL)	Raskin
Crist	Kennedy	Reed
Crow	Khanna	Rice (NY)
Cuellar	Kildee	Riggleman
Cunningham	Kilmer	Roby
Davids (KS)	Kim	Rodgers (WA)
Davis (CA)	Kind	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Danny K.	King (NY)	Rose (NY)
Davis, Rodney	Kirkpatrick	Rouda
Dean	Krishnamoorthi	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Kuster (NH)	Ruiz
DeGette	Lamb	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Langevin	Rush
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Rutherford
Delgado	Larson (CT)	Ryan
Demings	Lawrence	Sánchez
DeSaulnier	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Scanlon
Dingell	Lee (NV)	Schakowsky
Doggett	Levin (CA)	Schiff
Doyle, Michael	Levin (MI)	Schneider
F.	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
Engel	Lipinski	Schrier
Escobar	Loeb sack	Scott (VA)
Eshoo	Lofgren	Scott, David
Españolat	Lowenthal	Serrano
Evans	Lowe y	Sewell (AL)
Fitzpatrick	Luján	Shalala
Fletcher	Luria	Sherman

Sherrill	Swalwell (CA)	Van Drew
Simpson	Takano	Veasey
Sires	Taylor	Vela
Slotkin	Thompson (CA)	Velázquez
Smith (NJ)	Thompson (MS)	Visclosky
Smith (WA)	Titus	Waltz
Smucker	Tlaib	Wasserman
Soto	Tonko	Schultz
Spanberger	Torres (CA)	Waters
Spano	Torres Small	Watson Coleman
Speier	(NM)	Welch
Stanton	Trahan	Wexton
Stefanik	Trone	Wild
Stevens	Underwood	Wilson (FL)
Suozzi	Upton	Yarmuth

NAYS—124

Amash	Graves (MO)	Pence
Amodei	Green (TN)	Perry
Armstrong	Griffith	Posey
Arrington	Grothman	Rice (SC)
Babin	Guthrie	Roe, David P.
Baird	Hagedorn	Rogers (AL)
Balderson	Harris	Rose, John W.
Banks	Hern, Kevin	Rouzer
Barr	Hice (GA)	Roy
Bergman	Hill (AR)	Scalise
Biggs	Hollingsworth	Schweikert
Bishop (NC)	Hudson	Sensenbrenner
Bishop (UT)	Johnson (OH)	Shimkus
Bost	Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Brady	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Brooks (AL)	Joyce (PA)	Staubert
Buck	Keller	Steil
Burchett	Kelly (MS)	Steube
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Stivers
Cheney	Kinzing	Thompson (PA)
Cline	Kustoff (TN)	Thornberry
Cloud	LaHood	Tiffany
Comer	LaMalfa	Timmons
Conaway	Lamborn	Tipton
Crawford	Latta	Turner
Crenshaw	Lesko	Walberg
Curtis	Long	Walden
Davidson (OH)	Loudermilk	Walker
DesJarlais	Lucas	Walorski
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Watkins
Duncan	Marshall	Weber (TX)
Emmer	Massie	Webster (FL)
Estes	Mast	Wenstrup
Ferguson	McClintock	Westerman
Fleischmann	Meuser	Williams
Flores	Miller	Wilson (SC)
Fulcher	Moolenaar	Wittman
Gaetz	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Gibbs	Murphy (NC)	Woodall
Gohmert	Newhouse	Zeldin
Gooden	Nunes	
Gosar	Olson	

NOT VOTING—41

Abraham	Dunn	Mullin
Aderholt	Finkenauer	Norman
Allen	Foxx (NC)	Palmer
Bacon	Fudge	Reschenthaler
Brooks (IN)	Gianforte	Richmond
Bucshon	Graves (LA)	Rooney (FL)
Budd	Higgins (LA)	Scott, Austin
Burgess	Holding	Stewart
Calvert	Johnson (LA)	Vargas
Carter (GA)	King (IA)	Wagner
Carter (TX)	Marchant	Wright
Clay	McCarthy	Yoho
Collins (GA)	McHenry	Young
Cook	Mitchell	

□ 1129

Messrs. CHABOT, TIPTON, SMITH of Nebraska, FLORES, JOHNSON of Ohio, WITTMAN, and CURTIS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. PETERSON, RUTHERFORD, SIMPSON, and HUIZENGA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 233.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)	(Jeffries)	(Pallone)
Bera (Aguilar)	Kaptur (Dingell)	Payne
Bonomici (Clark (MA))	Kennedy (Kuster (NH))	(Wasserman Schultz)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)	Kim (Davids (KS))	Peters (Kildee (NH))
Brownley (CA) (Clark (MA))	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Pingree (Kuster (NH))
Carson (IN) (Cleaver)	Lamb (Golden)	Pocan (Raskin)
Castor (FL) (Demings)	Langevin (Lynch)	Porter (Wexton)
Cohen (Beyer)	Lawson (FL) (Demings)	Pressley (Trahan)
Costa (Cooper)	Lee (NV) (Kuster (NH))	Price (NC) (Butterfield)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Roybal-Allard (Garcia (TX))
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Lipinski (Schrader)	Ruiz (Dingell)
Doggett (Raskin)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Rush (Underwood)
Doyle, Michael F. (Cartwright)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Schneider (Casten (IL))
Escobar (Garcia (TX))	Lowey (Tonko)	Schrier (DelBene)
Frankel (Clark (MA))	McEachin (Wexton)	Serrano (Jeffries)
Garamendi (Sherman)	McNerney (Raskin)	Sires (Norcross)
Grijalva (Garcia (IL))	Meng (Kuster (NH))	Speier (Scanlon)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Moore (Beyer)	Thompson (CA) (Kildee)
Higgins (NY) (Sanchez)	Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman Schultz)	Titus (Connolly)
Jayapal (Raskin)	Nadler (Jeffries)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Johnson (TX)	Napolitano (Correa)	Welch (McGovern)
	Pascrell	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

Gooden	Long	Slotkin
Gosar	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Gotthelmer	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Granger	Marshall	Smith (NJ)
Graves (MO)	Masse	Smucker
Green (TN)	Mast	Spano
Griffith	McBath	Staubert
Grothman	McCaul	Stefanik
Guest	McClintock	Steil
Guthrie	McKinley	Steube
Hagedorn	Meuser	Stivers
Harris	Miller	Taylor
Hartzler	Moolenaar	Thompson (PA)
Hern, Kevin	Mooney (WV)	Thornberry
Herrera Beutler	Murphy (NC)	Tiffany
Hice (GA)	Newhouse	Timmons
Hill (AR)	Nunes	Tipton
Holding	Olson	Torres Small (NM)
Hollingsworth	Palazzo	Turner
Hudson	Pappas	Upton
Huizenga	Pence	Walberg
Hurd (TX)	Perry	Walden
Jacobs	Posey	Walker
Johnson (OH)	Reed	Walorski
Johnson (SD)	Rice (SC)	Waltz
Jordan	Riggleman	Watkins
Joyce (OH)	Roby	Weber (TX)
Joyce (PA)	Rodgers (WA)	Webster (FL)
Katko	Roe, David P.	Wenstrup
Keller	Rogers (AL)	Westerman
Kelly (MS)	Rogers (KY)	Williams
Kelly (PA)	Rooney (FL)	Wilson (SC)
King (NY)	Rose, John W.	Wittman
Kinzinger	Rouzer	Womack
Kustoff (TN)	Roy	Woodall
LaHood	Rutherford	Yoho
LaMalfa	Scalise	Young
Lamb	Schrader	Zeldin
Lamborn	Schweikert	
Latta	Sensenbrenner	
Lesko	Shimkus	
Lipinski	Simpson	

NAYS—218

Adams	DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)
Aguilar	Deutch	Larson (CT)
Allred	Dingell	Lawrence
Axne	Doggett	Lawson (FL)
Barragán	Doyle, Michael F.	Lee (CA)
Bass	Engel	Lee (NV)
Beatty	Escobar	Levin (CA)
Bera	Eshoo	Levin (MI)
Beyer	Espallat	Lieu, Ted
Bishop (GA)	Evans	Loebach
Blumenauer	Fletcher	Lowenthal
Blunt Rochester	Foster	Lowey
Bonomici	Frankel	Lujan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gaetz	Luria
Brindisi	Galleo	Lynch
Brown (MD)	Garamendi	Malinowski
Brownley (CA)	Garcia (IL)	Maloney
Bustos	Garcia (TX)	Carolyn B.
Butterfield	Golden	Maloney, Sean
Carbajal	Gomez	Matsui
Cárdenas	Gonzalez (TX)	McAdams
Carson (IN)	Green, Al (TX)	McCollum
Cartwright	Grijalva	McEachin
Casten (IL)	Haaland	McGovern
Castor (FL)	Hall	McNerney
Castro (TX)	Harder (CA)	Meeks
Chu, Judy	Hastings	Meng
Cicilline	Hayes	Mfume
Cisneros	Heck	Moore
Clark (MA)	Higgins (NY)	Morelle
Clarke (NY)	Himes	Moulton
Cleaver	Horn, Kendra S.	Mucarsel-Powell
Clyburn	Horsford	Murphy (FL)
Cohen	Houlahan	Nadler
Connolly	Hoyer	Napolitano
Cooper	Huffman	Neal
Correa	Jackson Lee	Neguse
Costa	Jayapal	Norcross
Courtney	Jeffries	O'Halleran
Cox (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Ocasio-Cortez
Craig	Johnson (TX)	Omar
Crist	Kaptur	Pallone
Crow	Keating	Panetta
Cuellar	Kelly (IL)	Pascarell
Davids (KS)	Kennedy	Payne
Davis (CA)	Khanna	Perlmutter
Davis, Danny K.	Kildee	Peters
Dean	Kilmer	Peterson
DeFazio	Kim	Phillips
DeGette	Kind	Pingree
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Pocan
DelBene	Krishnamoorthi	Porter
Delgado	Kuster (NH)	Pressley
Demings	Langevin	Price (NC)

MARIJUANA OPPORTUNITY REINVESTMENT AND EXPUNGEMENT  
ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 3884) to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 174, nays 218, answered “present” 1, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

YEAS—174

Amodei	Buck	DesJarlais
Armstrong	Burchett	Diaz-Balart
Arrington	Byrne	Duncan
Babin	Case	Emmer
Baird	Chabot	Estes
Balderson	Cheney	Ferguson
Banks	Cline	Fitzpatrick
Barr	Cloud	Fleischmann
Bergman	Cole	Flores
Biggs	Comer	Fortenberry
Bilirakis	Conaway	Fulcher
Bishop (NC)	Crawford	Gabbard
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Gallagher
Bost	Cunningham	Garcia (CA)
Brady	Curtis	Gibbs
Brooks (AL)	Davidson (OH)	Gohmert
Buchanan	Davis, Rodney	Gonzalez (OH)

Quigley	Serrano	Tonko
Raskin	Sewell (AL)	Torres (CA)
Rice (NY)	Shalala	Trahan
Rose (NY)	Sherman	Trone
Rouda	Sherrill	Underwood
Roybal-Allard	Sires	Vargas
Ruiz	Smith (WA)	Veasey
Ruppersberger	Soto	Vela
Rush	Spanberger	Velázquez
Ryan	Speier	Visclosky
Sanchez	Stanton	Wasserman
Sarbanes	Stevens	Schultz
Scanlon	Suozzi	Waters
Schakowsky	Swalwell (CA)	Watson Coleman
Schiff	Takano	Welch
Schneider	Thompson (CA)	Wexton
Schrier	Thompson (MS)	Wild
Scott (VA)	Titus	Wilson (FL)
Scott, David	Tlaib	Yarmuth

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—37

Abraham	Cook	McHenry
Aderholt	Dunn	Mitchell
Allen	Finkenauer	Mullin
Bacon	Fox (NC)	Norman
Brooks (IN)	Fudge	Palmer
Bucshon	Gianforte	Reschenthaler
Budd	Graves (LA)	Richmond
Burgess	Higgins (LA)	Scott, Austin
Calvert	Johnson (LA)	Stewart
Carter (GA)	King (IA)	Wagner
Carter (TX)	Loudermilk	Wright
Clay	Marchant	
Collins (GA)	McCarthy	

□ 1216

Mr. COOPER, Ms. BASS, Messrs. BUTTERFIELD, YARMUTH, and LARSEN of Washington changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. PALAZZO, GUTHRIE, NUNES, and GONZALEZ of Ohio changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, due to COVID-19, I was unable to vote the week of 12/2/2020. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall N. 232, “yea” on rollcall No. 233, and “nay” on rollcall No. 234.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)	Schultz	Moore (Beyer)
Bera (Aguilar)	Higgins (NY) (Sanchez)	Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman Schultz)
Bonomici (Clark (MA))	Jayapal (Raskin)	Nadler (Jeffries)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)	Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Napolitano (Correa)
Brownley (CA) (Clark (MA))	Kaptur (Dingell)	Pascarell (Pallone)
Carson (IN) (Cleaver)	Kennedy (Kuster (NH))	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Castor (FL) (Demings)	Kim (Davids (KS))	Peters (Kildee)
Cohen (Beyer)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Pingree (Kuster (NH))
Costa (Cooper)	Lamb (Golden)	Pocan (Raskin)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Langevin (Lynch)	Porter (Wexton)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Lawson (FL) (Demings)	Pressley (Trahan)
Doggett (Raskin)	Lee (NV) (Kuster (NH))	Price (NC) (Butterfield)
Doyle, Michael F. (Cartwright)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Rooney (FL) (Beyer)
Escobar (Garcia (TX))	Lipinski (Schrader)	Roybal-Allard (Garcia (TX))
Frankel (Clark (MA))	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Ruiz (Dingell)
Garamendi (Sherman)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Rush
Grijalva (Garcia (IL))	Lowey (Tonko)	Schneider (Underwood)
Hastings (Wasserman)	McEachin (Wexton)	Schrier (Casten (IL))
	McNerney (Raskin)	Schrier (DelBene)
	Meng (Kuster (NH))	Serrano

(Jeffries)Sires  
(Norcross)  
Speier (Scanlon)  
Thompson (CA)  
(Kildee)

Titus (Connolly)  
Watson Coleman  
(Pallone)  
Welch  
(McGovern)

Wilson (FL)  
(Hayes)

Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky

Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch

Wexton  
Wild  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Young

## NAYS—164

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. McCOLLUM). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 164, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

## YEAS—228

Adams	Garamendi	Morelle
Aguilar	Garcia (IL)	Moulton
Allred	Garcia (TX)	Mucarsel-Powell
Amash	Golden	Murphy (FL)
Axne	Gomez	Nadler
Barragán	Gonzalez (TX)	Napolitano
Bass	Gottheimer	Neal
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Neguse
Bera	Grijalva	Norcross
Beyer	Haaland	O'Halleran
Bishop (GA)	Hall	Ocasio-Cortez
Blumenauer	Harder (CA)	Omar
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Pallone
Bonamici	Hayes	Panetta
Boyle, Brendan	Heck	Pascarell
F.	Higgins (NY)	Payne
Brindisi	Himes	Perlmutter
Brown (MD)	Horn, Kendra S.	Peters
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Phillips
Butterfield	Houlahan	Pingree
Carbajal	Hoyer	Pocan
Cárdenas	Huffman	Porter
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Pressley
Cartwright	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Case	Jeffries	Quigley
Casten (IL)	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Castor (FL)	Johnson (TX)	Rice (NY)
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Riggleman
Chu, Judy	Keating	Rose (NY)
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Rouda
Cisneros	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Ruiz
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kilmer	Rush
Clyburn	Kim	Ryan
Cohen	Kind	Sánchez
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Cooper	Krishnamoorthi	Scanlon
Correa	Kuster (NH)	Schakowsky
Costa	Langevin	Schiff
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Craig	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Crist	Lawrence	Schrier
Crow	Lawson (FL)	Scott (VA)
Cunningham	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Davids (KS)	Lee (NV)	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Levin (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (MI)	Shalala
Dean	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Sherrill
DeGette	Lofgren	Sires
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Slotkin
DelBene	Lowey	Smith (WA)
Delgado	Luján	Soto
Demings	Luria	Spanberger
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Speier
Deutch	Malinowski	Stanton
Dingell	Maloney,	Stevens
Doggett	Carolyn B.	Suozi
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell (CA)
F.	Mast	Takano
Engel	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Escobar	McAdams	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	McBath	Titus
Espallat	McClintock	Tlaib
Evans	McCollum	Tonko
Finkenauer	McEachin	Torres (CA)
Fletcher	McGovern	Torres Small
Foster	McNerney	(NM)
Frankel	Meeke	Trahan
Gabbard	Meng	Trone
Gaetz	Mfume	Underwood
Gallego	Moore	Vargas

Amodei	Griffith	Posey
Armstrong	Grothman	Reed
Arrington	Guest	Rice (SC)
Babin	Guthrie	Roby
Bacon	Hagedorn	Rodgers (WA)
Baird	Harris	Roe, David P.
Balderson	Hartzler	Rogers (AL)
Banks	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (KY)
Barr	Herrera Beutler	Rooney (FL)
Bergman	Hice (GA)	Rose, John W.
Biggs	Hill (AR)	Rouzer
Billirakis	Holding	Roy
Bishop (NC)	Hollingsworth	Rutherford
Bishop (UT)	Hudson	Scalise
Bost	Huizenga	Schweikert
Brady	Hurd (TX)	Sensenbrenner
Brooks (AL)	Jacobs	Shimkus
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Simpson
Buck	Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Burchett	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Bustos	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Byrne	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Chabot	Katko	Spano
Cheney	Keller	Staubert
Cline	Kelly (MS)	Stefanik
Cloud	Kelly (PA)	Steube
Cole	King (NY)	Stivers
Comer	Kinzing	Taylor
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Thompson (PA)
Crawford	LaHood	Thornberry
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Tiffany
Cuellar	Lamb	Timmons
Curtis	Lamborn	Tipton
Davidson (OH)	Latta	Turner
Davis, Rodney	Lesko	Upton
DesJarlais	Lipinski	Van Drew
Diaz-Balart	Long	Walberg
Duncan	Lucas	Walden
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Walker
Estes	Marshall	Walorski
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Waltz
Fleischmann	McCaul	Watkins
Flores	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Meuser	Webster (FL)
Fulcher	Miller	Wenstrup
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Westerman
Garcia (CA)	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Gibbs	Murphy (NC)	Wilson (SC)
Gohmert	Nunes	Wittman
Gonzalez (OH)	Olson	Womack
Gooden	Palazzo	Woodall
Gosar	Pappas	Yoho
Granger	Pence	Zeldin
Graves (MO)	Perry	
Rush	Peterson	
Green (TN)		

## NOT VOTING—38

Abraham	Cox (CA)	McHenry
Aderholt	Dunn	Mitchell
Allen	Ferguson	Mullin
Brooks (IN)	Fox (NC)	Newhouse
Bucshon	Fudge	Norman
Budd	Gianforte	Palmer
Burgess	Graves (LA)	Reschenthaler
Calvert	Higgins (LA)	Richmond
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Carter (TX)	King (IA)	Stewart
Clay	Loudermilk	Wagner
Collins (GA)	Marchant	Wright
Cook	McCarthy	

## □ 1308

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on December 3, and 4, 2020, due to not being in town. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “no” on rollcall No. 230; “no” on rollcall No. 231; “no” on rollcall No. 232; “no” on rollcall No. 233; “yes” on rollcall No. 234; and “no” on rollcall No. 235.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 233, I am not recorded because of circumstances which caused me to miss the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

On rollcall No. 234, I am not recorded because of circumstances which caused me to miss the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

On rollcall No. 235, I am not recorded because of circumstances which caused me to miss the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)	Kaptur (Dingell)	Payne
Bera (Aguilar)	Kennedy (Kuster)	(Wasserman)
Bonamici (Clark)	(NH)	Schultz)
(MA)	Kim (Davids)	Peters (Kildee)
Boyle, Brendan	(KS)	Pingree (Kuster)
F. (Jeffries)	Kirkpatrick	(NH)
Brownley (CA)	(Stanton)	Pocan (Raskin)
(Clark (MA))	Lamb (Golden)	Porter (Wexton)
Carson (IN)	Langevin	Pressley
(Cleaver)	(Lynch)	(Trahan)
Castor (FL)	Lawson (FL)	Price (NC)
(Demings)	(Demings)	(Butterfield)
Cohen (Beyer)	Lee (NV) (Kuster)	Rooney (FL)
Costa (Cooper)	(NH)	(Beyer)
DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Roybal-Allard
(Matsui)	Lipinski	(Garcia (TX))
Deutch (Rice)	(Schrader)	Ruiz (Dingell)
(NY)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Rush
Doggett (Raskin)	Lowenthal	(Underwood)
Doyle, Michael	(Beyer)	Schneider
F. (Cartwright)	Lowey (Tonko)	(Casten (IL))
Escobar (Garcia)	McEachin	Schrier
(TX)	(Wexton)	(DelBene)
Frankel (Clark)	McNerney	Serrano
(MA)	(Raskin)	(Jeffries)
Garamendi	Meng (Kuster)	Sires (Norcross)
(Sherman)	(NH)	Speier (Scanlon)
Grijalva (Garcia)	Moore (Beyer)	Thompson (CA)
(IL)	Mucarsel-Powell	(Kildee)
Hastings	(Wasserman)	Titus (Connolly)
(Schultz)	Schultz)	Watson Coleman
Higgins (NY)	Nadler (Jeffries)	(Pallone)
(Sánchez)	Napolitano	Welch
Jayapal (Raskin)	(Correa)	(McGovern)
Johnson (TX)	Pascarell	Wilson (FL)
(Jeffries)	(Pallone)	(Hayes)

## □ 1315

## LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring to the majority leader the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend and the majority leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for legislative business. Members are advised that votes are expected as early as 2 p.m.

I want to repeat that. We are going in at 12 p.m. Votes can be as early as 2 p.m.

This is unusual for the first day of the week. I have advised and urged Members to stay here this weekend—most of them I have talked to are—because, clearly, we are trying to get two critical pieces of legislation done, which we will speak to, I think, in a little bit.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning—



hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

I advise Members that we still have to pass an omnibus and we have to pass a COVID-19 relief bill, and we will not adjourn the Congress until such time as we can accomplish those two objectives.

I was hopeful that we would accomplish those objectives by next Thursday. Unfortunately, things are not moving as rapidly as I think they ought to—I would like them to, but as they ought to be moving—so that Members need to be advised that they need to keep their schedules very, very flexible until such time as we pass both of those pieces of legislation.

We will, in addition, consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business today.

I will say something further on suspensions. Somebody said: Oh, well, we are not passing important bills.

That is not accurate. Somehow, when we have agreement, it is not looked as important. On suspensions, it simply means we have an agreement between the parties that we can pass those bills because they are bipartisan and the overwhelming majority of Members agree on them. So we are passing bills that are good bills but not controversial, and that is a good thing.

But we will consider several bills under suspension. As I said, the complete list will be available at the close of business today.

The House will consider the fiscal year 2021 National Defense Authorization Act conference report. I am very pleased that we have a bipartisan, bicameral agreement on NDAA and look forward to it overwhelmingly passing both Chambers next week and, if necessary, overriding a threatened veto by President Trump.

This is a critically important bill to pass. It always passes, and I am hopeful that we will come together on this bill. It was a tough conference but a good conference, and the result, I think, can be supported by both sides of the aisle, signed, obviously, by the Senate Republican chairman and our chairman here in the House.

As Members know, the continuing resolution expires on December 11; therefore, the authority for spending to keep government running will expire on the 11th. The Committee on Appropriations is hard at work on reaching an agreement on an omnibus, and I hope to bring that to the floor as early as possible. I am hopeful that will be next week.

Frankly, I have had a discussion with Senator MCCONNELL. I am told there is no agreement that we cannot make on the 11th that will be easier to make on the 18th, which is the end of the following week. I would urge Members, however, to ensure that they are available for the week of the 14th if we have not completed our business by next week.

The House may also consider additional legislation to address the coronavirus pandemic, as I have already said. The House has passed two different Heroes bills.

We passed the bill on May 15th, 6 months ago, to deal with this extraordinary crisis placing millions of Americans at risk, causing deep emotional and physical distress and a challenge not only to their health, but also to their psychological welfare, and to educating our children and keeping our schools safe and providing the resources necessary that, if we can get children back in school—which I think all of us want to do—that we can accomplish that objective.

The House has also passed, on October 1, some 2 months ago, a \$2.2 trillion bill. That was not taken up by the Senate. The Senate has passed no legislation since May 15th. They did not consider our bill either time, neither the Heroes 1 bill nor the Heroes 2.

It is unfortunate, in my view, that Senate Republicans have failed to act, even if they didn't act on what we wanted to do. I am pleased that the Speaker and Senate majority leader spoke yesterday. I have spoken to him three times this week, and I hope that we can get an agreement. The House stands ready to act next week.

Lastly, as everybody understands, when you get to the end of a session, we don't contemplate everything that might be on the agenda, so other pieces of legislation may be on the agenda next week or the week thereafter.

Again, I reiterate, I am very hopeful that we can get this business done by next week.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I scheduled the 11th as the CR day is because I wanted to make sure we could get Members home. With the COVID crisis, the pandemic has exploded.

Members ought not to be aggregating here on the House floor or aggregating here in Washington. They ought to be home. And if we got out on the 11th—I want to get through on the 10th so we can send a bill to the Senate. However, if we left on the 11th, it will be 14 days before Christmas, and, therefore, if Members leaving Washington had to quarantine themselves, they would have sufficient time to do so so that they could be with their families on Christmas Day.

I would hope that everyone on the Committee on Appropriations, the leadership—myself included—would feel the urgency of passing this needed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

There are a few items relating to legislation that I want to bring up with the gentleman, but before that, I did want to mention that it is my understanding that the floor director for the majority leader, Ms. Shuwanza Goff—the last thing I would want to do is embarrass her here on the House floor, but

it is my understanding she may be leaving.

Mr. HOYER. It is a vicious rumor that has been spread abroad in the country.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield time to her if she would like to deny that rumor, but while that may create some issues, I would like to say that, if this is the last time that we do this colloquy before the end of this year, it has been a true pleasure to work with Shuwanza Goff.

My whole staff has enjoyed working with her, and especially on those areas where we agree—the CARES Act and USMCA come to mind as recent major accomplishments that this legislative body has done together, Republicans and Democrats—and she, I know, has been that conduit who works with our staff on the Republican side. We considered it a true joy to work with her. She doesn't schedule every bill I ask her to schedule, but I will blame that on the majority leader, not on Shuwanza.

Mr. Speaker, if I can, in all seriousness, say, it has truly been a treat and a joy, and she is one of the people who makes this place work when it does work.

We can always talk about the things that we would like to achieve that we can't, but there are many important things we achieve, like those important pieces of legislation I talked about and many others that don't get that same kind of attention, but they wouldn't happen without the work and the great leadership that Shuwanza has demonstrated here. She will be missed here, and I just wanted to mention that.

I know the gentleman feels probably even stronger, because she has worked for him for the whole time I have been in leadership, but, I think, going back to maybe 2008.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I may get into this next week, and I am hopeful that the gentleman is right that we don't have a colloquy next week, that we would have completed our business, as I have been talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I have been blessed, the House has been blessed, the country has been blessed by Shuwanza Goff's leadership on this floor on my behalf and on the majority's behalf, working closely with the minority. And I know that Shuwanza would want me to say that she looks forward to the same kind of cooperation in her new job that she has gotten in her old job, and if the gentleman wants to assure her of that, I will yield to him.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I will give this assurance to the majority leader, that if you are looking for a replacement, I would be happy to provide recommendations and even participate in the interview process, if that would be helpful to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is most generous.

Mr. SCALISE. I think the generosity probably ends there with today's colloquy. I am sure we will have that opportunity next week to have a longer conversation, but I truly do want to pass that on to Shuwanza, and not just on behalf of myself, but on behalf of the minority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, and his staff, as well as mine, and all of us in leadership who get to work with her.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to mention, on the schedule next week, one of the items that I know we have worked on together and talked about that I believe the gentleman has scheduled for next week is S. 578, which is the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act, something that we have worked on, a number of these items, for people with ALS.

The Steve Gleason Act was one of those items we worked on a few years ago, passed to help people with ALS, and has been a tremendous, tremendous benefit to people struggling with ALS.

Steve Gleason is a constituent and a dear friend, somebody whom we have worked with on many things. He received earlier this year—it seems like years ago, but just January of this year, he was the recipient of the Congressional Gold Medal, and deservedly so.

He and I were communicating earlier this week about this legislation, which I am a cosponsor of, and I just want to thank the gentleman for scheduling that for the floor next week.

One of those areas, as you were talking about earlier, that might not get a lot of attention but an issue that both Republicans and Democrats have worked on is to help people with ALS who, right now, under current law, even after the diagnosis with ALS—as we know, it is just a devastating diagnosis—have to wait 5 months to get the normal benefits that they are entitled to. And time is very, very critical to people with ALS. This eliminates that 5-month gap where they would have to wait, one of those additional occasions where it takes an act of Congress to fix this.

The Senate acted, and quickly, now, the House will be acting to address this deficiency that needs to be fixed. I think you will see both sides come together with a very large vote, but I thank the gentleman for scheduling that for the floor next week.

I yield to the gentleman, if you have anything to add on that.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I was pleased to schedule this. Obviously, as you know, it passed the Senate the other day. Hopefully, we will pass it on suspension next week and it will be sent to the President. Hopefully, the President will sign it.

Obviously, ALS is just a terrible, terrible disease, and a disease that acts very, very quickly, which means that there is a premium on the govern-

ment's response to assisting people with ALS be quick as well.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, what this bill does is it provides an acceleration for people who are suffering from and afflicted with ALS to get assistance. So, hopefully, the House will pass it and will send it to the President.

I appreciate the gentleman's cosponsorship of the bill.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as relates to the schedule next week, as well as the schedule we have had this week, I want to bring up a piece of legislation that we have talked about here in this colloquy and in other venues for months now, and that is the bill by Congressman CHABOT, H.R. 8265, which is the Pay-check Protection Program Extension Act.

We have seen over these last few months our small businesses have struggled tremendously. Some industries have done better during this pandemic where they have seen increased sales for various reasons, but we have mostly seen and heard from so many of those businesses and industries that have been devastated, some harder than others, but so many devastated to the point of bankruptcy. Daily, we see stories of businesses that closed their doors for good.

Mr. Speaker, in the State of New York alone, it was reported that one-third of all small businesses—one-third—will never open again. We came together to do the CARES Act, to pass that lifeline to so many small businesses—saved probably 50 million jobs in America, saved millions of small businesses—but it expired; and when it expired, we learned a lot more about where our economy was at that time.

When we passed it, it was at the very beginning of the pandemic. We now saw over those months which businesses were doing better, which weren't, and came back in September with a piece of legislation that would free up money that is not going to have to be borrowed, money that is actually sitting in that account, frozen, \$137 billion that we already appropriated. But the program expired so it can't be used anymore unless we change the law.

So, we are not talking about creating a new program. We are talking about going back to a program that was maybe one of the most successful things that we have done to help people in need—not just those small businesses, but the millions, 50-plus million people whose livelihoods depend on those jobs.

The bill was brought forward, had a lot of bipartisan interest, but for various reasons hasn't been scheduled on this House floor. And there were reports that maybe it was tied to waiting on the election or whatever other things.

In fact, the Speaker of the House, just today, made a comment that one of the reasons a certain relief package bill wasn't brought to the House floor

is because she was waiting on a "new President." I hope that was a quote that was made out of context or maybe needs to be revised.

□ 1330

There are millions of people that are literally facing the elimination of their livelihoods, and we have a bill that, if it was put on the floor today, yesterday, or September, when we first had this conversation, there would be hundreds of thousands of businesses still open today that are now bankrupt, that will never open again. Every day we wait, more businesses don't reopen.

Clearly, we are negotiating to try to get an agreement on bigger issues. We are not there. We weren't there last month; we weren't there the month before. The Senate has tried to take up votes on things. It wasn't the Republicans; it was the Democrats that blocked those bills coming up. This, by the way, was one of those in the package that would have been voted on by the Senate, if not for Senate Democrats blocking even the debate on the Senate floor. So they never had that debate.

On this floor, just today, we saw a bill to legalize marijuana. You saw items in there where it would give additional money to people in the marijuana industry. This is something that Congress, I am sure, will continue to debate.

But there is a pandemic where, today, we have businesses that are shutting their doors. Tomorrow, businesses will go bankrupt forever, small businesses. We can help them. Not with a new program that we need to negotiate the details over, but something we already did that was so highly successful that we have a track record to show what it can do.

Our small banks, local community banks, were part of that process and are ready to go again. Again, we don't need to reinvent the wheel here. This is an existing program that has got existing, remaining money, but the program is frozen and expired. This bill just renews it and could pass on the suspension calendar, and it still hasn't been brought up.

While we are negotiating other things, why not release this hostage and let this bill pass. It could have been done today. It wasn't a lack of time. When we are debating legalizing marijuana instead of saving small businesses, that is a misplaced priority of this Congress. We should have come together months ago. September 16, it was introduced. September 17, I brought it up to the majority leader at this colloquy. The following week brought it up again.

Then we filed a discharge petition. You had, I think, 23 Democrats sign a letter saying they would sign that discharge petition if we didn't get a bipartisan agreement, recognizing that the Heroes Act is not a bipartisan agreement. Unfortunately, not one of those Members who signed the letter saying

they would sign the discharge have signed the discharge. Talk is cheap around here.

Livelihoods are being lost. Businesses are shuttering for good. Why can't this bill be scheduled for the floor while we work on the other things that we are not in agreement on? This is something we are in agreement on. But it won't be scheduled for the floor.

Maybe we can get an agreement to schedule that Monday when we are coming in at 2 o'clock to vote on other items. This would be something that would get 400-plus votes, if it was just scheduled.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observations. He is right; we are for this.

We are also for making sure that children have food on their tables. We are also supportive of making sure that education facilities have the money to keep their venues safe and to keep education flowing. We are also for making sure that childcare is available to parents who can go back to work, when and if their children go back to school.

We are also for having critical money for testing and tracing and, yes, for delivering the vaccinations. Yes, we are for that, and we are also for States and localities that are hemorrhaging revenue to have the resources to continue to be on the front line of fighting the battle against COVID-19.

We are also for resources, not only to have created the vaccine—almost all of which is being funded by the Federal Government—but we are also for making sure we can deliver that vaccine and have vaccinations as well as having a vaccine.

We are very strongly for helping the extraordinary number of unemployed, who are on unemployment insurance, and who, at the end of this month, are going to find it goes away. We are for having an additional enhancement of that unemployment insurance, which so many economists will tell you from the CARES Act, was absolutely essential to keep the economy afloat.

And the fact that we have kept the economy afloat, as shown by—apparently, the stock market thinks we are okay—the millions and millions and millions of families who are in deep distress and are not okay. I am appalled by the fact that we have not acted.

We have acted twice. You say it was partisan. That is true; you chose not to vote for it. It wasn't much different than the CARES Act, which you did vote for. But, apparently, shortly after we passed the Heroes Act, your leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, said, Let's wait and see what happens. And Senator MCCONNELL said, Let the States go bankrupt.

Well, they are on that road. And we have seen what happened by waiting. We have thousands of our fellow citizens dying every week, now over 260,000 Americans; millions afflicted.

So I tell my friend, Mr. Speaker, that we care about PPP, and we took care of

it in both bills we passed. It wasn't a question that they were partisan or not partisan. They weren't taken up in the United States Senate. We passed them. They were not taken up.

Yes, the Senate leader offered a bill that every economist with whom I have talked said was not substantive enough, not sufficient resources to stop the hemorrhaging, and to help fight COVID-19.

So I tell my friend, we are for that bill. What we are not for is forgetting the kids, the families, the hospital workers, the researchers, the States, the localities. We are not for forgetting them. We believe that if we pass one part of a multifaceted response to COVID-19 and the implication for our economy, that will not be what our economy, nor our people, need.

We would ask you to talk to the Senate or to offer your own bill. Offer your own bill that deals with all of those millions of people that I just referenced that are in deep, deep distress. We need to deal with the small businesses, and we do. We need to deal with the unemployed and we do.

We have a lot of things expiring on December 31, PPP—your bill, does not deal with any of that. We need to deal with all of it. We ought to do it. Mr. CHABOT's bill ought to be a part of that, and it will be, because we are committed to that. But we are also committed to not forgetting all of those people and elements that I mentioned.

I want to help the airlines. And, hopefully, that will be in any deal that we come to. I want to help the restaurants. These are people who, through no fault of their own, are devastated.

So I tell my friend, he is right, but only partially so. He is right that we ought to be helping the small businesses. But I don't think there is a small businessman in America that would say let the nutrition issue go, as we see lines of cars and lines of people getting food boxes so they can put food on their table for their kids and themselves, people who never, ever, expected in their lives to be in a food line. I think the small businessmen would say, take care of them. I think the small businessmen would say, I haven't been able to pay taxes, and I know the State is still operating hospitals, still fixing the roads, still hiring police and fire, and hiring nurses in public hospitals. They need help, too.

We are all in this together. That is my response to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

We want to have a comprehensive bill that will deal with a comprehensive threat to our economy and to the health of our people and to the welfare of our people. We think that is the responsible thing to do.

I am hopeful that we can get an agreement in the near term. When I say, "the near term," by next week. I have been talking to Senator MCCONNELL towards that end. The Speaker is

talking to Senator MCCONNELL towards that end.

The Senators are working on an effort to get that done. I am hopeful they are successful. The Speaker and Mr. SCHUMER said it was a place that they could negotiate from, which means we are closer than we have been, and I hope it gets done.

Mr. SCALISE. Let me remind the gentleman that in the CARES Act, we addressed many of those issues that the gentleman already brought up, starting with the States.

In fact, I don't know of a single State in this country who has spent all of the money we sent them. Educational opportunities for schools to reopen safely and educate kids are being denied in some places but not in others, but it is not from a lack of money. There is not a single school system I have heard from, where we sent them the money—and by the way, they still have millions, and in some cases, billions of those dollars sitting in their account, idle, that can be used today to safely reopen schools.

If the State chooses not to do it or if the school system chooses not to do it, that is on them. But they are denying those kids opportunities. We are seeing report after report, scientific studies, the American Academy of Pediatrics, talking about the damage that is being done to our young children by being denied the opportunity to go back to school in classroom and learn. It is devastating to those kids.

Suicides are up and opioid abuse is up, because of all of these things, and it is the small businesses that are paying the biggest price.

If you look, people that are getting unemployment insurance at the State level—we did enhanced unemployment insurance for a period of time, and in most cases we were paying people more money not to work than they were making before they lost their job.

What they ask me is not that they want to stay on unemployment. They want to go back to work. They want their business to be alive when they go back to work. But if a small business closes for good, the cost to us is going to be dramatically higher.

If we can right now throw that lifeline, again, to those businesses—not with a new program, not with things that we don't agree on, like \$900 billion to bail out failed States, which is the Heroes Act. We already spent hundreds of billions of dollars that we gave to States. Like I said, I think every single State has some of that money left. Some have billions of dollars of that money left.

So the idea that we are going to hold up relief to small business, who are closing every day, hundreds of thousands—a third of every small business in the State of New York is gone for good. How many more need to die before this problem is recognized by this Congress?

So those States are sitting on money, and the gentleman wants to hold up relief to small businesses to give another

\$900 billion to bail out States, not for the COVID damage, but the problems they had before. That is what the Heroes Act disagreement was about. We agreed on giving States money. They still have some of that money, and it can be used to reopen schools safely, still today.

What is not there right now is relief for those small businesses. So when you look at all of these different things—the vaccine, they are not waiting on approving a vaccine based on more money coming in. We put money in the CARES Act, and President Trump spent it effectively on Operation Warp Speed to get us to the point where we have not one, but two—Pfizer and Moderna—ready to go.

The FDA is about to approve two different vaccines, and it is being mass produced today. We are not waiting on money to mass produce it. The Department of Defense is actually involved in helping distribute it. Airlines have already been contracted to get it out. Some need to be air-conditioned more than others. All of that is put in place.

If we need more money, we will come together and get more money. But a vaccine is not waiting on us to send them more money. We need to get it out. We need the FDA to follow their process, which they are doing. They are the gold standard in the world for approving vaccines, and it is unheard of, in the history of mankind, for a virus, that we didn't even know of until a year and two days ago in the world, to now be on the brink of not one, but two FDA-approved vaccines. That is happening because of what we did coming together with the CARES Act and then President Trump's Operation Warp Speed.

These aren't items that are waiting on our relief. What is waiting is relief for small businesses.

Now, the Heroes Act, again, it was a partisan exercise, not because it was mostly like the CARES Act. It was very different from the CARES Act. In the Heroes Act, there are billions of dollars in that bill to give checks to people here illegally. That wasn't part of any agreement. It wasn't in the CARES Act. That is new policy that is not going to be signed into law.

If you want to negotiate and hold small businesses hostage on that, we may never get relief for small businesses. But that was one of the items in the Heroes Act where we had no agreement.

□ 1345

But the areas where we had agreement, can we at least agree to pass the things we have agreement on?

And what did we have more agreement on than anything? The PPP, proven to be so successful that literally every day we hear from small businesses that say they would not be alive today if not for the PPP. But we also hear from small businesses every day who are about to close.

Some States are talking about shutting their whole State down again.

We know that is going to lead to businesses that will never come back. And we have a bill ready to go that would get massive bipartisan support without a new dime of money, money sitting frozen in an account that would help those small businesses. The criteria is you have to have at least 25 percent loss.

So your small businesses that are doing well today—again, we know there are some that are doing better today than they were a year ago, but we also know some are about to close for good. We can help them, not with new policy that we are not in agreement on. That is where the negotiations are continuing to go back and forth on.

But if there is something we all agree on, do we really need to hold that hostage, when that means that many of those businesses will never come back?

We could have done this in September. It was brought up in September. It is not a new item.

How many thousands of businesses died from the day that that bill was introduced to today and will die again between now and Monday?

It can be put on the schedule Monday. It is not going to stop the negotiations on the other things. There are other things that we are both in agreement on that aren't part of that bill. Bring that as a stand-alone. Let's bring each of those items that we are in agreement on.

But the idea that we hold everything hostage to things that aren't going to happen, hundreds of billions to failed States, giving checks to people who aren't here legally, is that really a priority?

Is that really the things we are getting called on every day?

The folks that are on unemployment want to be able to go back to their job. If the company is dead and gone, there will be nothing to go back to. And so we are working on so many items that we are in agreement on. We have given money to our health experts to continue to focus on the virus, to continue to get the vaccine, and we may have another two—could be four—vaccines by the end of this year. That is something we all ought to applaud because of what we did when we came together.

But here is an area where we already came together. It was so successful that that money now is frozen, and those businesses that did well are still doing well. The ones that aren't will or will not be alive in a month from now, based on whether or not we confront this. It is not new policy. It is something we already agreed on, and something we already celebrated as a success. Let's do that one more time while we negotiate on the things we are in disagreement with.

Mr. Speaker, I would just suggest that, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for suggesting that. I didn't hear him talk about the children who are having trouble getting food on

their tables every morning and every evening. I didn't hear him talk about the unemployed, the 12 million American workers who are going to run out of unemployment as of the end of this month.

Mr. Speaker, I did hear him talk about the failed States. Let me tell you, Maryland is not a failed State, and our Governor is a Republican. His name is Hogan. His father served in this body. He, along with Mr. Cuomo, the Governor of New York, said the States, meaning all the States, need substantial assistance or they are going to have to make substantial cuts. In my State, we have made cuts, and we are a wealthy State. We have made cuts, which have undermined the States's ability to respond as robustly as they need to do to COVID-19.

Now, the President wants to talk about failed States. What he really means is blue States, Mr. Speaker. That is what he means—large States like New York; large States like California. By the way, Florida and Texas are in the same position. Now, Texas has a greater surplus. But failed States is a fake news item.

Mr. Speaker, what we should do is come together and have an agreement. Now, we can pass something here, and we did pass something here. The Republicans chose to join us, Mr. Speaker, on the first three bills. One was an \$8.3 billion bill responding to \$1.2 trillion or \$2.2 trillion that the President asked for. In other words, four times what the President asked for. In terms of what we have done, that seems like small potatoes, a lot of money.

But it was clear that the administration's response to this crisis was woefully inadequate, represented by that first bill that they sent to us, knowing full well that it would not even come close to meeting the needs. So we increased it about 400 percent. The Speaker then negotiated with Mr. Mnuchin and came up with two additional bills that were passed in a bipartisan fashion.

And, very frankly, the President told us this was about to go away. Not to worry. It is going to go away. It will go away tomorrow maybe or next week. It is going to go away when the weather gets warm. And Dr. Fauci said: No, Mr. President, that won't happen. So, essentially, the President dismissed Dr. Fauci as a principal adviser. Thankfully, Mr. Biden, President-elect Biden, is going to bring him back as the principal adviser, one of the great experts in the world on vaccines and on infectious diseases.

So I am somewhat frustrated that we focus on one facet. But I will tell you, if those 12 million people become unemployed without assistance, they won't have any money to spend on small businesses. If those States don't have the ability to operate properly, that will hurt small businesses. If the transportation system faltered, it will hurt small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, my point is that we are *e pluribus unum*: Out of many, one. We

are a nation reliant upon one another, and the harm to one results in the harm to the other. Therefore, we believe that there ought to be a comprehensive piece of legislation, as there was overwhelmingly supported.

But the Republicans, after CARES, and when we passed the Heroes Act in May, passed it on May 15, they thought everything was hunky-dory and they walked away.

Mr. MCCONNELL said the States can go bankrupt. Think of the consequence that would have had. And, yes, we gave them some money under CARES. Nobody, when we voted on CARES, thought we would be where we are today. Nobody, except Dr. Fauci, and some other experts, scientists, medical personnel, said: Look, this thing is going to come back, that is what happens with these pandemics. They have an original assault, and then they come back. And they came back with a vengeance, and people are losing their lives.

And the failure to pass a comprehensive bill—we agree, we want to help these small businesses. Heroes 1 helped small businesses. Heroes 2, you didn't vote for those. You said they were partisan. I am not sure what was partisan about them. They were no more partisan than the CARES Act was partisan. Mr. Speaker, the difference was, very frankly, the Republicans decided they were going to vote for CARES, and then they decided, we have done enough. And we have been twisting in the wind now for 6 months since we passed Heroes.

I don't want to make a speculation of how many hundreds of thousands or tens of thousands of lives may have been saved had we passed Heroes 1, or we acted much sooner out of the administration. But I am hopeful we can get rid of all this "who struck John, you did it, I did it, who did it," and come to grips in the next 7 days, maybe 14 days. There is no reason why we can't come to an agreement.

There is a bipartisan group in the United States Senate, Republicans and Democrats, who have come up with a bill, \$908 billion. Now, that is a lot of money. But what they try to do is deal with all of the issues that I have raised, and they do. Maybe not as much as I think we ought to do, maybe not as specifically targeted as I think, but it is a basis for agreement. And I hope the Senate passes it. I hope they pass it next week and send it over to us.

I guarantee you when they send it over to us, we will act on it. We won't leave it sitting, as Heroes 1 and Heroes 2 have sat in the Senate for 6 months, or 2½ months. We won't let it sit.

Why?

Because the country is at risk. Our people are at risk. Our children are at risk. Our families are at risk.

Mr. Speaker, as you so correctly point out, the whip points out that our businesses are at risk. He is absolutely right and we need to act. But if we only act on small businesses and we don't

take care of the other problems, the small businesses ultimately will not be able to survive either. We are in this together.

We do not have a policy on this side of the aisle saying: You are on your own, children; you are on your own, unemployed; you are on your own, States, localities, municipalities, small towns, small counties.

That is not our policy. We are in this together, and we want to help all of those in distress.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I will have anything more to say on this particular item, but I am appreciative of Mr. CHABOT's bill. I hope that his bill is included, and I hope that we can pass something next week to help all of those in deep distress. That would be good for our country. It is the right thing to do. It is the moral thing to do, and I hope we do it. I will facilitate it when we get to an agreement. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, too. In terms of our children, we know sending them back to school safely, the protocols are out there. Child nutrition programs are administered in our schools. That is not happening because the kids are in those systems where they are not safely reopened. Those kids aren't able to get the school lunch programs.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't know about your school system, but my school system is still providing meals for kids either as a pick-up at the school or delivery at some site, because that is a critical problem, but they need money to do that. We know that food banks are stretched, and we need to deal with that program. That is my point. It is not just small businesses. It is that nutrition program.

I just wanted to clarify that in my school districts, we are delivering meals, notwithstanding the fact that schools are shut down.

Let me say something else just as an aside. Three of my counties have a majority, if not unanimous, county commissioners who are all Republican. They have all voted to keep the school systems virtual, as have my other counties.

I represent five counties, essentially, or parts thereof. They have all voted. Hearing from parents and teachers, and perhaps some students, they are all virtual. They will need as much money to continue virtuality as they will to get kids back in school. They need extra resources to do that.

The \$908 billion bill that is agreed or proposed by a bipartisan group in the Senate has money in that bill for those programs.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, those schools already have access to the \$150 billion that we sent the States that they haven't even already spent. If I gave you money to do something and

you haven't even used all that money, you can't use that as an excuse for not doing it, and saying: I am waiting for you to give me more money, when you still have money remaining.

And I agree with the gentleman on the school lunch program. The thing there is that we don't give a supplement to schools in normal times. These are not normal times. But in normal times, schools feed kids at lunch with the existing budgets they have. They don't wait for us to send extra money to them to feed the kids.

If they are not educating the kids in the classroom, they are still taking that money. I haven't seen them rebate the money to those families in communities.

So what are they doing with that money?

If you bring the kids back and educate them safely in the classroom, which the protocols allow for in any community, high risk, low risk, if you have got a high outbreak, there are different ways to handle each community. The CDC has given them guidelines. The Academy of Pediatrics have given them guidelines. Some school systems have chosen not to follow them and leave the kids at home, but they are still taking the money.

□ 1400

There has never been a better argument for school choice and letting parents choose. If one school system is willing to educate your child safely and the other is not, why shouldn't you be able to take that money and send your child to the place that is willing to do it safely for you?

It is not a question of the money. It is a question of the will to do it.

But when we talk about those businesses and what was in the CARES Act and what wasn't, the CARES Act was not the Heroes Act. I think the gentleman knows some of the differences. I will tell the gentleman a few of the differences.

What is in the Heroes Act that is not in the CARES Act that we all voted for was letting thousands, an unknown number of thousands, of criminals out of prison. I have never gotten a straight answer on how many thousands of criminals would be let out of prison or why that even needs to be in a COVID relief package. But that is in the Heroes Act, which was not in the CARES Act, and we are completely in disagreement on that.

Why it hasn't been dropped out, who knows, but that is a choice the majority made. Again, sending direct checks, billions of dollars in direct checks, to people that are here illegally was not in the CARES Act; it is in the Heroes Act. If we wanted to make it bipartisan, drop those things out. But they haven't been dropped out by the majority, and here we have a program that we agree on.

But in terms of the small businesses, the small businesses are dying on the vine because some States are giving

mixed signals, changing rules, going backward, forward. In States like California, they are saying you can operate as a liquor store or as a strip club but not as a church. Even the Supreme Court stepped in and said that is ludicrous and that you can't keep doing it.

But you go to New York and so many of these States where they are saying for safety protocols you have to shut down and you can't go to a restaurant, and then you see the Governor of the State at a restaurant without a mask. But you can't go. You see mayors in communities telling businesses they can't stay open or it is not safe to have Thanksgiving with your family, and you find out they are flying to other States to have Thanksgiving with their family.

This blatant hypocrisy by some of these leaders who are telling you that you have to live your life one way and they are living their lives a different way, and hiding behind protocols that don't exist, that is driving people nuts. The businesses are dying because of it.

The trust in government gets depleted in those places because they are watching. And it is not isolated. I wish it was just once or twice. I wish it was never going on. But it is over and over again, yesterday and today another story comes out of a local leader or a governor telling you that you can't do something, and they are doing it. They didn't think they were going to get caught doing it. My God, that has to end. The hypocrisy has to end.

Let's get back to saying things that make sense, working with the protocols, working with the experts and the scientists. But don't use a scientist selectively and say something that is not really true and you, yourself, know it is not true because you are doing it. That is what some of those folks are doing. It is driving people nuts, and it is driving their businesses under. They will never come back.

Those families that are struggling and the kids that are going to have trouble eating are having that trouble because the businesses that their families work for are being bankrupted by crazy, radical policies that have to end. We can help them in the short term. We ought to help them in the short term.

Some of the stuff I mentioned that we are not in agreement on ought to get dropped out. But in the meantime, don't hold them hostage. Let's bring those things that we agree on to the floor and save the businesses that we can because every day we don't, more will never come back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, this business about illegals getting money, let me just give you an example. You have a husband and wife and three children living in an apartment. The husband does not have authorization to be here. What the bill provided for, that the gentleman talks about, is making sure we feed those

children even though somebody who is illegal is living in the household.

What they want to have done is nobody in that household got help. It is just a difference of perspective. And I get it.

But let me tell you something. What you can't get away from is, Mr. Speaker, they have not passed a bill through the United States Senate. Why? Because it would require compromise. Because you don't have the votes, Mr. Speaker, in the Republican Party to pass a bill without compromise. So they have sent us no bill.

Now, Mr. MCCONNELL can say all he wants: Well, we need 60 votes, and they won't give us 60 votes.

He is right. And he won't compromise.

Your side, on a regular basis when you were in charge, couldn't pass a lot of pieces of legislation that had to be passed, and what did John Boehner do? Walked over here and said: Madam Leader, Mr. Whip, can you help us?

And we did. President Bush asked for TARP. He couldn't get the votes on your side. Where did he come? To our side. We passed it, which saved the country from a depression.

So when you are talking about all this stuff, we sent two bills. You didn't like them, fine. Pass something through the Senate. But it would have required compromise, and Mr. MCCONNELL offered no such compromise.

I think, frankly, we ought to move on because I don't think we can beat this horse anymore. We are not going to agree. But pass a bill. Have a comprehensive bill that helps those children, that helps those unemployed, that helps those renters who can't pay their rent and are going to be evicted.

Do you think that helps small businesses? Do you think it helps grocery stores? Do you think it helps barber-shops? Do you think it helps gasoline stations? It does not because they are going belly up, and they don't have any resources.

We are in this together. What I keep telling him, Mr. Speaker, and what I keep telling my side, as well, we are in this together, and we need to help everyone who is in such distress, not just small businesses. We need to help small businesses.

The airlines continue to say they are going to stop flying. This doesn't help them.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if we wanted to pass another CARES Act-type piece of legislation, as we have seen in both other CARES Act bills, you have a lot of willingness and interest on this side of the aisle, which was there on both of those votes. Clearly, there are things in Heroes that there is no bipartisan consensus on.

So, our party is willing and ready to go another round on those items we agree on, and not months from now, not months ago, as it should have been done. It should be done today. Hopefully, it will be done when we return. I would be happy to work with the gentleman on those items.

If the gentleman has nothing else, then I would be happy to yield back.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing else.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDER of California) laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 7, 2020.

Ms. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: I hereby submit my resignation, effective Monday, December 7, 2020 at 12:00 p.m. EST, as the United States Representative of the 8th District of California. Attached is the letter I submitted to the California Secretary of State.

Sincerely,

PAUL COOK.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 7, 2020.

Hon. ALEX PADILLA,  
Secretary of State, California Department of  
State, Sacramento, CA.

DEAR SECRETARY PADILLA: I hereby submit my resignation, effective Monday, December 7, 2020 at 12:00 p.m. EST, as the United States Representative of the 8th District of California. Attached is the letter I submitted to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

PAUL COOK.

#### MARKING A VICTORY FOR VIETNAM VETERANS

(Mr. HARDER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a long-overdue victory for our Vietnam veterans.

For decades, tens of thousands of Vietnam vets haven't got the benefits that they deserve. Even though diseases like Parkinson's, hyperthyroidism, and bladder cancer are scientifically linked to Agent Orange, they still aren't covered by the VA.

But, today, I am thrilled to say that veterans exposed to Agent Orange can finally stop fighting their own government because my bill, the Fair Care for Veterans Act, is on track to become the law of the land.

I want to dedicate this effort to Joshua Melendez of Modesto, California, and Lyle Ducheneaux of Turlock, California, two local veterans who will personally be impacted by this change.

Most of all, I want to dedicate this effort to my grandfather, First Sergeant Albert Z. Simmons, whose life was cut tragically short by Agent Orange. I wish he could be with us today to see this.

These veterans fought for us. It has been my honor to fight for them. God



bless you, and thank you for your service.

#### THANKING STAFF MEMBERS

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member on the Subcommittee of Environment and Climate Change, I want to thank Chief Counsel Mary Martin, Deputy Chief Counsel Jerry Couri, and senior professional staff member, Peter Spencer, for their tremendous support of me and common-sense, practical legislation that has protected human health and the environment and supports jobs and the economy.

If the public knew how hard that committee staff members work, they would have a better appreciation of our government. Mary, Jerry, Peter, you have my personal thanks.

I would also be remiss if I didn't thank the loyal opposition, Democrat Staff Director Rick Kessler and Democrat Senior Counsel Jackie Cohen. Although many times adversaries, both have become friends.

#### INVESTING IN JUSTICE REFORM

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the MORE Act, and I urge our colleagues in the Senate to do the same.

There is a serious need for justice reform in our country, a focus on restorative financial justice. Investment in research, along with descheduling, is something that we must lead on.

COVID innovation zones in our country might be a strategy for bringing bipartisan solutions that create jobs but also dealing with this terrible pandemic.

#### HONORING DR. MARK EUTSLER

(Mr. BAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor Linden, Indiana, resident Dr. Mark Eutsler.

This year marks the 25th year that Dr. Eutsler has co-chaired the nationally televised IPL 500 Festival Parade. Using his experience as the former director of bands at McCutcheon High School, he has helped over 45,000 students from 425 Indiana schools participate in the nationally acclaimed IPL 500 Festival Parade.

Prior to his appointment as co-chair, Dr. Eutsler has served as an enthusiastic supporter of the Indianapolis 500 Festival for decades. Mark has attended the parade consistently since

1980 and has been a volunteer for the event for 29 years.

Dr. Eutsler's consecutive years of service stand out among the more than 3,000 volunteers who will fill roughly 7,000 positions for the month-long May event every year.

Dr. Mark Eutsler is a pillar of the community. I express my deepest thanks and appreciation for his passion and for the service he has devoted to a program that defines Hoosier heritage.

#### HONORING ZEENATH HUSSAIN

(Mr. LEVIN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my retiring director of constituent services, Zeenath Hussain. It may not be common to speak on the floor of this House about a staffer, but Zee is truly an extraordinary public servant and human being.

In 2004, Zee answered an ad for a staff assistant position in my dad's, Sandy Levin's, district office. Over the years, she built an incomparable network of relationships with officials in an astounding array of Federal agencies and an unmatched mastery of how to solve virtually any constituent problem.

Even after 16 years of service, in a pandemic causing untold suffering and chaos, Zee listened to each constituent attentively, leveled with people when necessary, and comforted and reassured every family member.

In addition to her tireless work for constituents, Zeenath took care of everyone around her, mentoring generations of congressional staff, dispensing advice about life, and cooking to-die-for Indian meals for the office and anyone who happened by.

Zee, I reluctantly admit you have richly earned the right to retire from your job, but I hasten to add that there is no retiring from friendship or from love.

□ 1415

#### RECOGNIZING PLACER COUNTY SHERIFF ANDREW SCOTT

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Placer County, California, Sheriff's Office Lieutenant Andrew Scott and his 30 years of dignified service.

Since joining the sheriff's office in 1990, Lieutenant Scott has worked in nearly every capacity. I personally saw his outstanding leadership and dedication as a Placer County Deputy Sheriff's Association president.

Over the decade I have known him, I have witnessed his love and passion for the public safety of his community. He is a shining example of what a warrior, a man of God, embodies: a true friend,

defender of the weak, devoted to truth, dedicated to his loved ones, and strong in his faith and love of the Lord.

Andrew has gone above and beyond to provide support for his fellow law enforcement officers through the 10-35 organization. His dedication to never forget officers who have fallen in the line of duty should be an example to all of us to remember those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of all of our freedoms.

Andrew's service as Placer County Sheriff's Office Lieutenant has made our area a safe place to live, a better one, a better one to raise our kids.

I consider Andrew a true friend, and I wish him the best during his retirement.

#### WE HAVE A JOB TO DO

(Mr. PAPPAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because our country is in trouble. We are facing a devastating pandemic, an economic crisis, and things will continue to get worse if Congress fails to act.

I can't imagine there is a Member of this body who has not had the same conversations I have had with small business owners, healthcare professionals, local leaders, educators, and workers out of a job.

People are exasperated. They are hurting and they are tired. They feel like Washington isn't coming through for them, and they are right.

We have a job to do, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Representatives who are here to serve the people in our districts and secure the future of this Nation.

This week, Members of the House and Senate announced a framework for COVID relief legislation. It is not everything everyone wants, no compromise is, but it will fundamentally save lives and keep our economy moving forward.

Heading home for the holidays without addressing this crisis will have disastrous consequences, so let's all commit ourselves to this process of finding a way forward and getting to "yes."

#### THE CORONAVIRUS IS EXPLODING

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, the coronavirus is exploding, our hospitals are bursting, and many parts of our economy are hurting. It is no wonder why Fed Chair Powell and so many other economists are warning about the long-term damage that could be done if we don't pass another stimulus package soon.

We passed the CARES Act earlier this year, and that did keep our economy afloat and our poverty rate flat,

but because of the pandemic, we are experiencing over 1 million cases a week and 2,000 deaths a day.

Because of that, we are finding ourselves in more self-induced economic comas, just like we are seeing in my State of California and my district on the central coast of California.

We can't wait any longer for another economic package. That is why Democrats and Republicans of the Problem Solvers Caucus worked with a bipartisan group of Senators to come up with a targeted and temporary package of close to \$1 trillion to meet our most pressing needs. It is a compromise that can be a way to "yes" for both Houses and both sides to come together.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a dark winter, so it is our obligation to our constituents to come to the table to negotiate and pass a pandemic relief package to help us get on the road to recovery this spring.

#### BRING AUSTIN TICE HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDER of California). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise.

I rise today on behalf of my constituents, Marc and Debra Tice, the parents of Austin Tice.

Marc and Debra have asked that I extend their sincerest gratitude to the House of Representatives, all of its leadership and membership, for the passage of H. Res. 17, a resolution that, in effect, supports the President's desire to bring their son home.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to their request, I thank Speaker PELOSI, because I had a personal conversation with Speaker PELOSI about this resolution, and I believe that that led to its coming to the floor.

I thank Majority Leader HOYER. He, in effect, orchestrated the bringing of this resolution to the floor.

I thank Congressman HILL for his support of the resolution at the committee level and for his efforts to bring his constituent, Dr. Kamalmaz, home.

I thank the outgoing chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ELIOT ENGEL, for his efforts to bring the resolution out of committee.

I also thank the ranking member, the Texan, Mr. McCAUL, who is a person who has worked with me on many endeavors. He made this bipartisan early on, and I thank him for what he has done to help us get it through the committee.

I thank Senator CORNYN, Senator MURRAY, the 41 cosponsors of H. Res. 17, the 52 Senators and 152 Representatives who signed on to a letter to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Debra Tice to President Trump.

FRIDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 2020.

DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMP, Thank you, from the entire Tice family, for your steadfast

commitment and determination to bring our beloved Austin safely home.

Yesterday there was a news story from the region that Austin Tice had been released and was on a plane headed home. Our phones were going crazy, our email was exploding, Twitter, Facebook, Instagram—every kind of social media was buzzing with an outpouring of high hopes and great joy. Many, many news outlets reached out eagerly hoping to verify this great news.

We know you can make this joyful news a reality. We know the Syrians are ready to work with you.

Please, please bring Austin home for the holidays.

Respectfully,

DEBRA TICE.

Debra—Working so hard on this. Looking for the answer. We want Austin back. I will never stop—

DONALD J. TRUMP.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, while they have asked me to extend their gratitude, I personally would like to thank the Tice family for their unwavering commitment to have Austin returned home and allow him to be with his family and his friends.

They also wished that I would thank President Trump on their behalf. I have a letter that is the best evidence of why they would have President Trump be thanked for what he has done.

The letter reads: "Friday, 13 November 2020.

"Dear President Trump,

"Thank you, from the entire Tice family, for your steadfast commitment and determination to bring our beloved Austin safely home.

"Yesterday there was a news story from the region that Austin Tice had been released and was on a plane headed home. Our phones were going crazy, our email was exploding, Twitter, Facebook, Instagram—every kind of social media was buzzing with an outpouring of high hopes and great joy. Many, many news outlets reached out eagerly hoping to verify this great good news.

"We know you can make this joyful news a reality. We know the Syrians are ready to work with you.

"Please, please bring Austin home for the holidays."

It is signed, "Respectfully, Debra Tice," Austin's mother.

The President is known to respond to letters of this kind by simply writing on a copy of the letter a message to be returned to the sender.

I shall read the President's statement:

"Debra—Working so hard on this—Looking for the answer. We want Austin back. I will never stop."

Mr. President, I salute you for your desire and your commitment to bring Austin home. And, Mr. President, I pray that it will be done before Christmas. It would be a wonderful thing, Mr. President, for this family that you now know and you have communicated with, for this family that has suffered for some 8 years without their son.

You would do well and serve them well, Mr. President, if you would honor

the commitment that you have indicated on this letter. It would bring joy unlike any these parents have ever experienced if you would do so.

So, Mr. President, I salute you. I salute you for your desire and commitment to bring Austin home. And I suspect that it has a lot to do with the fact that he is an American citizen, but I also suspect, Mr. President, that it has a lot to do with what you know about Austin.

Austin is an American hero, a veteran captain of the Marine Corps. Austin loved his country. He was willing to fight for it and, if necessary, sacrifice his life for it.

Austin played by the rules. In college, at age 16, he wanted to be a lawyer. But also, Austin was one of those rare, unique persons who not only wants to help, but who is willing to go to great lengths, great extremes to be of service.

He was a freelance journalist, as you know, Mr. President, and as such, he was willing to go into harm's way to places that most of us would never go into to be of service, to help people. So Austin decided that he would take his talents and his desires to Syria.

He went to Syria, and he crossed over the Syrian border in May of 2012. In August of 2012, he was detained at a checkpoint someplace near Damascus, and he has been missing ever since.

There have been what we call in the intelligence agencies, I believe, signs and proof of life. We know that he is alive, and we know that 8 years of this experience is taking a toll on Austin.

Austin deserves our greatest efforts to bring him home, because Austin is an American hero. His parents are in need of his touch, of his presence. They need to hug their son.

So the appeal has been made, and, Mr. President, you have said that you believe that you will do everything that you can. I am paraphrasing. You said you will never stop and that you are looking for the answer.

I believe the answer is within your power, and I believe the Tice family will be eternally grateful, as will most Americans, if you will bring their son home and do so before Christmas.

On behalf of the Tice family, Mr. President, I salute you for your desire and your commitment to bring him home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to a perceived viewing audience.

□ 1430

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is an honor to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), my friend that is apparently in his last term in this body. Hopefully, he will be serving in another body.

REFLECTIONS ON THE PRIVILEGE OF SERVICE IN  
THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Today, as we wrap up three terms, we could not be more overwhelmed with the privilege that it has been to serve the people of North Carolina, specifically, central North Carolina, in the United States Congress.

I am the oldest of three boys, Mr. Speaker, of a Baptist preacher from the Panhandle of Florida and have had the privilege to live in North Carolina since 1991. Coming out of college, and having the opportunity to work, spending 16 years as a pastor, and then the last 6 years of serving in a different capacity.

What an honor to be able to walk the halls and to be able to think about the history that has made this country what it is today.

We were blessed to hit the ground running, becoming the first Member since its inception in 1973 to be elected chairman at the end of their first term of the largest caucus, the conservative caucus of the Republican Study Committee.

Recently, I have enjoyed extending and wrapping up a term as the vice chair of the GOP Conference. What a privilege it has been to serve the bulk of that time as cochairman with Senator JAMES LANKFORD of the Prayer Caucus. It has been a wonderful time to gather each Monday evening—in fact, many people don't even know the Prayer Caucus exists—for us to gather on that Monday evening after we fly in and for many years to gather in room 219, right off to my right, and seek God's guidance as we prayed for constituents and we prayed for the Lord to give us the hope and direction for this country.

I have lots of reflections over these last 6 years. I think of having a chance to be the starting pitcher for the Republican baseball team, an exhibition game for charity. Every year has been quite a treat.

I am sure many of my Republican friends are glad to see that the Honorable CEDRIC RICHMOND is now senior adviser to another gentleman and no longer in the House.

But what a privilege it has been to see the efforts that goes to the Boys and Girls Club, Mr. Speaker. And it has been neat that this has been a tradition since 1909.

And there have been other times. There was the moment when I saw STEVE SCALISE, our whip, come back from our teammates being shot at that morning, and how he came back and has come back strong; and how he has always represented his faith in a way that I think has impacted potentially far beyond any political work that he may do in this House.

There have also been times to engage in a more stern manner, serving on the House Oversight Committee with Chairman Jason Chaffetz. Chairman Chaffetz did a wonderful job as the House Oversight Chairman as we went after and questioned some of the unscrupulous behavior of James Comey and Pharma Bro. In fact, I still think Peter Strzok doesn't really care for me, but that is okay because sometimes the job requires it.

One of the moments that stand out on the House Oversight Committee was questioning Cecile Richards, Mr. Speaker, when I asked her specifically: Does it bother you that there are more African-American babies aborted in New York State than actually born? I will never forget that she was not even aware of that statistic.

Nor did I shy away from the fights on this floor. Probably the darkest or the heaviest moment was when we were working and going back and forth late into the night on the born alive amendment. And I cannot help remembering just the heaviness and the oppression of that night, as only three of my colleagues on the Democratic side stood up and said a baby that survives a botched abortion should have the right to stay alive.

I struggled with that. I still struggle with it. In fact, I think it is apparently evil not to be able to stand up and fight for all of us who are created in the image of God.

We have heard other comments. The dogma lives loudly. Even a good friend and colleague from Illinois that was pro-life, that was someone who advocated, is no longer part of the body and was basically run out of town. I struggle with those things.

If our rights come from our Creator and, as our Founding Fathers said they have in the past, do they not also come from the Creator in the present and in the future?

Not too far behind us here is the rotunda. There are eight pictures in the rotunda. The first four are depictions of our settlers, the people who founded this country who came here. In all four of those pictures, there is a depiction of Christianity.

The other four are depictions of our Founding Fathers. The last one is my favorite. It is George Washington. The picture is of George Washington, December 23, 1783, and in his hand he has his resignation.

For 8 years, he had been the commander in chief of the Revolutionary Army. Yet, in that letter he writes, though he had, potentially the ability, the military power behind him to be something of almost a monarch again, he captured something. He realized that if this country was going to be great, he had the foresight in that letter to write that the power had to come from we, the people. What a powerful expression.

As I think back over the last 6 years, I have traveled different places, 20-something different countries. No place

at all has impacted me more than standing there on the shores there at Normandy. And as our guide began to talk that day, I thought about this for the first time.

History shows us that those young men were supposed to have air cover but, because of the horrific weather, there was none. That day wasn't won by military might; wasn't won by great generals or colonels and military genius. Our freedom today, we can trace back to that moment, was won by 18- and 19-year-old young men who kept running up that hill, one wave after the other. What a powerful place and what a privilege it is to see these real heroes.

Arthur Ashe put it this way when he talked about heroism. He said: True heroism is remarkably sober, very undramatic. It is not the urge to surpass all others at whatever cost, but the urge to serve all others at whatever cost.

In our 6 years, we have tried not to stick with the talking points. Maybe we have had a little bit of a different approach serving in Congress. I never surrendered my voting card either to the establishment, to leadership, or any special interest group.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the best kind of representative that you could have is someone who is pledging to represent all communities. You see, America is the greatest country and the longest-lasting republic in the history of the world; but the truth is, we didn't get it all right to start with.

We first launched this idea of individual liberty and opportunity, but it took a few people and a few years to get it right: The likes of Frederick Douglass, George White, Shirley Chisholm, Jackie Robinson, Mahalia Jackson, my friend, Clarence Henderson, and so many more heroes. But here's the cool part of the story: We never quit trying until our actions matched our words that in America all men would be created equal.

One of the privileges that I have had is to serve with John Lewis and cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge and to spend some time hearing his story and hearing his history, because I believe this, whether Republicans or Democrats, relationship is the conduit for good policy. People before the politics.

You don't have to throw out what you believe or your values or your principles. But are you genuine? Do we show up? Do we always have to be the keynote speaker at times?

I was committed to doing this, to be both a conservative and a bridge builder, and our team committed to that. Hardly a week went by that we didn't answer the question, are we making an argument, or are we making a difference?

In this town, those who make the most noise sometimes get the key roles. But in looking back, making the difference is ultimately the prize.

The successes? I believe it is simple; staying close to the Lord and having

the people pray and wrap their arms around us.

So many times, after spending a week in this arena, this gladiator arena, you go back home depleted and kind of worn out. And I will never be able to express my gratitude to the people who lifted their arms up and prayed for us week after week.

A couple of months ago, I met Freddy in New Bern, North Carolina. Freddy's a little street vendor with his guitar, and he had his guitar case open and was hoping to make a few bucks. I had a chance to harmonize with him as he played Let My Little Light Shine.

What a reminder this season that, ultimately, what our calling is, it is to let our light shine.

I think of Luke 2; I think of all the different things in this season that mean so much.

In this city, there are some ups and downs, there are some double-crosses, but I can tell you, I leave today with no bitterness, no axe to grind, not jaded, with a genuine love for my colleagues.

I specifically have to point out three that I have had the privilege of getting to know and having dinner with, basically, for about 3½ years, almost once a week, Tuesday evenings with Trey Gowdy, Senator TIM SCOTT, and the Director of National Intelligence, John Ratcliffe. I love these men. They have impacted my life. There were times the fellowship and the joy and the laughter, and even the merciless cutdowns from Mr. Gowdy, were incredibly rewarding and timely.

But there are people behind the scenes here in Washington, D.C., names that you will never know, but people like Everette, Carmelita, Lloyd, the people behind the scenes that continue to impact.

In closing today, I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the people that made this possible, both in North Carolina and here in Washington, D.C. My appreciation to Janine, Grace, Joel, Bradley, Kyle, Phillip, Emily, Wayne, Olga, Jerome, Amber, Cory, Ryan, Kevin, Madeline, Dan, Alexa, Carson, Sruthi, Sean, Janae, Alison, Rudy, Kate, Katie, Louis, Davis, Rusty, Zach, Scott, Arian, Josh, Carter, Keifer, Wayne, Luke, Graham, Lauren, Brian, and two chiefs, Scott and Jack, and a deputy chief, Julie, who has been with me since the very beginning. I am proud of you guys. We made a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to conclude by thanking my family, Ryan, Rachel, Anna Claire, and Kelly. Thank you for allowing me to do something that is considered pretty special by many.

To my mom and dad, thank you for investing in me and putting in the values.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close right now by expressing it may be in the words of Andrae Crouch:

"How can I say thanks for the things You have done for me? Things so

undeserved, yet You gave to prove Your love for me; the voices of a million angels could not express my gratitude. All that I am and ever hope to be, I owe it all to Thee. To God be the glory."

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend. He has been a real asset here in the House, and I look forward to more accomplishments in the days to come.

Speaking of people I have served with, now she is a Senator, MARSHA BLACKBURN of Tennessee, very proud of her home State. She is doing a great job as a Senator, just as she did a great job in the House.

She has become the object of ridicule by a Chinese state-owned media editor. This article was written by Christina Wong, December 3. It says: The European Union Bureau Chief and columnist for Chinese state-run media outlet China Daily lodged a profane insult at U.S. Senator MARSHA BLACKBURN, Republican from Tennessee, on Thursday in a tweet.

BLACKBURN, a respected conservative Senator who is a hawk on China, tweeted Thursday: China has a 5,000 year history of cheating and stealing. Some things never change.

□ 1445

Chen Weihua, EU bureau chief and columnist for China Daily, then responded to her tweet with: Witch, spelled with a B, Senator BLACKBURN.

Chen then followed up with another tweet that said: This is the most racist and ignorant U.S. Senator I have seen. A lifetime witch, spelled with a B at the start of the word.

The gentlewoman retweeted his one-word reply to BLACKBURN. BLACKBURN responded a couple of hours later in a statement. She said: "From Tiananmen Square to Uighur genocide, Communist China is an expert at slaughtering populations. America will not bow down to sexist Communist thugs."

Breitbart News' James Pinkerton profiled Chen in May. He wrote: "Chen Weihua works for the government-owned China Daily, reliably cranking out articles with headlines such as 'White House must concentrate on fighting outbreak, not China-bashing,' and, 'Washington must stop making decisions which undermine WHO.'"

"In other words, his journalistic output nicely coincides with the People's Republic of China's propaganda plans, from deflecting blame for the coronavirus away from Beijing to defending Beijing's minions at the World Health Organization."

Chen has previously tweeted: "Trump and Pompeo are not even good liars."

Pinkerton noted that Chen bashes the President and his administration reliably, but also eagerly, echoing top Democrats and leading never Trumpers.

Chen has also called Senator JOSH HAWLEY, a Republican from Missouri, another leading China hawk in the

Senate, "ignorant." HAWLEY responded: "#China not happy about my call to confront their economic imperialism by ending the WTO and replacing it with a system that is good for American workers. I love being insulted by #China state-run press."

Pinkerton noted that Chen has been the beneficiary of many liberal programs in the U.S.

Chen lists on his blue-checkmark verified Twitter bio he was a John S. Knight Journalism Fellow at Stanford and a World Press Institute Fellow at Macalester College in Minnesota. He also listed the Freedom Forum in Washington, D.C.

So isn't that special. Perhaps one of these institutions is where he learned to call women witches, spelled what a B wherever it was. He is not a very polite person and is very defensive of being part of a misogynistic, sexist, racist, and religion-hating administration. He is apparently proud of that. It is very unfortunate.

But I am proud of Senator BLACKBURN. We are known by our friends, but we are known even more by our enemies, and Senator BLACKBURN has a real enemy there.

I was reminded back early on in my time in China when we went to China. She and I, the two of us, personally confronted, in Beijing, the Chinese bureaucrat in charge of enforcing copyright and patent fraud, which was just overwhelming in China. The amount that the state appeared to not only allow but actually be involved in was pretty staggering. At one point, either MARSHA or I asked: Why do you allow all of this patent fraud and copyright theft to go on?

The Chinese bureaucrat indicated that, actually, they don't. They step in, and, in fact, he said the year before, they had seized the assets from 500 different vendors who were selling copyright- or patent-infringed goods. Whether DVDs, CDs, things that violated Americans' patents, they seized them.

I said: So what did you do with what you seized?

I don't know Chinese law, but his indication was that, well, under Chinese law, we can't just destroy goods that have value, so we had to do something with them.

It appeared very clear that they seized these assets that were violating international trade, copyright, and patent laws. If they are not allowed to destroy such goods, then, obviously, they had to get rid of them since they felt they had value. So, the Chinese Government must have gotten into the business of selling copyright- and patent-infringed goods. So, there is not a lot of comfort there.

MARSHA and I did talk back then, and once you get away from the center of the Chinese Communist Party in Beijing and you get around to different cities in China, Mr. Speaker, we were both reminded they were so hospitable, so gracious, and so wanting you to

have a good experience in their towns. It reminded us both of Southern hospitality here in the U.S. The people were absolutely wonderful, Mr. Speaker. You just had to get away from the central government before you saw just how wonderful and fantastic the Chinese people are.

But in Beijing, you have the hotbed of Communist Party activity. Although there are some in the United States who are wanting to get to being a Communist nation as quickly as possible, we see, anytime there is a Communist government, it is not good for the people at all.

Another story from Simon Kent, December 1: "No Twitter 'Fact-Check' Warning on Chinese Official's Fake Photo of Australian Soldier Beheading Child."

A lot of people have seen the photo, yes, but the Chinese produced a photo that was falsified. The Australian soldier was not about to behead a child. It is just more fake information out of the Chinese Communist Party.

I guess if you are Twitter, Mr. Speaker, that is not something you would fact-check. You only want to fact-check honorable and honest people with whom you have disagreements. You wouldn't want to fact-check someone who is providing you a lot of money despite their retraining camps, their lies, and their official misrepresentations. You wouldn't want to do that because they might be tempted to cut back the revenue to your form of business.

So, as Chris Plante says, if it weren't for double standards, they would have no standards at all there at Twitter.

Twitter expands hate speech rules. Well, of course, you are not going to go after people who truly are full of hate, Mr. Speaker. They think conservatives are hateful. As a Christian, we are admonished by Jesus to love one another. We were admonished by Jesus Himself to love the Lord your God with all your heart, mind, and soul. The second is like it: Love your neighbor as yourself.

So, Christianity is truly a religion based completely on love. It is such an incredible thing to base a religion on, but that is what it is. God so loved the world He gave His Son; His Son so loved the world He gave His life. Then, you have people saying: Well, these Christians and these churches are full of nothing but hate, when actually that is doing what the Chinese Communist Party does. You are taking something out of context and actually perverting the actual beliefs of Christianity.

Twitter is expanding hate speech rules that will allow them to continue to produce things and get revenue from the Chinese Communist Party and not call into question their true hate of groups that might disagree with them. You run over them with a tank if they disagree with you even though they are unarmed. That is the kind of thing that Twitter is embracing here.

But this story from Lucas Nolan, 3 December, says: "Twitter has once

again expanded its hate speech policies to 'prohibit language that dehumanizes people on the basis of race, ethnicity, or national origin.'"

That is really rich coming from Twitter since they embrace the Chinese Communist Party and their hatred and their dehumanization of Uighurs, Christians, and people who want to have more than one child, and based on race, ethnicity, and national origin.

"Engadget reports that social media platform Twitter has expanded its hate speech policies again, this time to 'prohibit language that dehumanizes people.'"

And on it goes: "The change in policy comes more than 2 years after Twitter said that it intended to ban dehumanizing language and over 6 months from that last change to the site's policies that banned hate speech relating to age, disability, and disease."

So, anyway, again, if it weren't for double standards, Twitter would have no standards at all.

This article from Rich Noyes, November 24, "The Stealing of the 2020 Presidency: The Media Kept the Truth From Americans": "A new study shows that if the media didn't apply a leftist bias to its Presidential news coverage, Donald Trump would have comfortably won a second term as President."

"To measure the true effect of the media's censorship on the election, the Media Research Center asked The Polling Company to survey 1,750 Biden voters in seven swing States—Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin—six of which, all but North Carolina, were called for Biden. We tested these voters' knowledge of eight news stories, all important topics that our ongoing analysis had shown the liberal news media had failed to cover properly. We found that a huge majority, 82 percent, of Biden voters were unaware of at least one of these key items, with 5 percent saying they were unaware of all eight of the issues we tested."

"This lack of information proved crucial: One of every six Biden voters we surveyed, 17 percent, said they would have abandoned the Democratic candidate had they known the facts about one or more of these news stories. A shift of this magnitude would have changed the outcome in all six of the swing States won by Joe Biden, and Donald Trump would have comfortably won a second term as President."

Now, that is from Newsbusters. I really like those folks, but they are wrong about that. As we saw from the results and what occurred, and we are seeing more evidence every day, this concludes Donald Trump would have won comfortably. But as many of us know, there would have been more trucks with more fake ballots that would have been brought in, so the claim would have been made anyway that Donald Trump did not win because they just needed to know how many ballots they needed to overcome and they would bring them in to do so.

□ 1500

Consistent with that, from Just the News, David Payne—it is a story about what has been going on.

Sworn testimony of several whistleblowers on Tuesday—and this isn't like the fake whistleblower against President Trump that didn't actually hear the conversation. He was basing it on double hearsay. These are actually whistleblowers who had firsthand knowledge of what went on. And when they testified under oath from those who say there is no evidence, it is unfounded to say there was fraud, it is not their fault they are saying that, it is just they are very uneducated.

So to help with that, when a witness has firsthand knowledge, personally observe, personally saw something occur, and they put that in a sworn affidavit, then we have evidence. It is not unfounded. I know people that have said that. It is not their fault. They are just ignorant, uneducated on what is evidence and what isn't. But sworn testimony is evidence when it is first person.

And there are some exceptions to the hearsay rule that lots of articles have been written about and discussed in legal treatises. But in this case, it is not hearsay for most of these things that have been produced.

But sworn testimony of several whistleblowers alleged what one election integrity activist is calling "potential ballot fraud on a massive scale," with multiple eyewitnesses testifying to alleged suspicious behavior in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.

In a press conference in Arlington, Virginia, the Amistad Project—a civil liberties initiative of the Thomas More Society—presented the testimony of three individuals who claim to have witnessed apparent voting malfeasance—that means wrongdoing for those that don't know about evidence—during the 2020 election.

One, Jesse Morgan, a truck driver for a subcontractor with the United States Postal Service, claimed that a trailer he was driving, one full of potentially upwards of 288,000 ballots, disappeared from its parked location at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, U.S. Postal Service depot after Morgan dropped it off there. Morgan had transported these ballots from Bethpage, New York.

Well, that is interesting. You could have 288,000 voting ballots that were produced in Bethpage, New York, and supplied to Pennsylvania—apparently, having already been voted in. And it is possible that people would want to give them the benefit of the doubt. It is possible they had 288,000 people from Pennsylvania just temporarily residing in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and wanted to vote absentee in the Pennsylvania election.

So, yeah, maybe it is possible that 288,000 Pennsylvanians were not in Pennsylvania pursuing homemade pumpkins pies—Perry Como used to sing—that they were actually in Bethpage, New York.

The subcontractor also reportedly experienced "odd behaviors" from U.S. Postal Service personnel, behaviors which postal experts have said in sworn statements, "grossly deviated from normal procedure and

behavior,” according to a press release from the Amistad Project.

Mr. Speaker, by the way, for anybody that might be uneducated on the ways of court evidence, in a civil matter such as this, the normal standard of proof is a preponderance of the evidence, just the slightest evidence more showing that conduct probably was in appropriate. That is enough. It does not have to be beyond a reasonable doubt unless you are getting ready to prosecute people under criminal laws.

Once you move into the criminal realm to prosecute people guilty of election fraud, then it does need to be beyond a reasonable doubt but not to establish a standard for an injunction to prevent decertification or to force decertification after certification, or to actually declare an election invalid, even. That is a burden of more probable than not, or probable cause rather than beyond a reasonable doubt.

Another whistleblower, Nathan Pease of Madison, Wisconsin—himself also a subcontractor for the U.S. Postal Service—alleged that he was told that the postal service was planning to backdate tens of thousands of ballots in the days after the November 3 election in order to circumvent the ballot submission deadline.

A third witness, Gregory Stenstrom—who testified at a Pennsylvania legislature hearing in Gettysburg last week—claimed to have witnessed a Dominion Voting Systems vendor inserting jump drives into voting aggregation machines in Delaware County, Pennsylvania.

And for those that don't know, that is not appropriate under the situation, as was here. And it really shouldn't be appropriate in any situation. We need to do away with the ability to have some foreign-owned counting service, like we have had in Texas, in the big cities—no county that wasn't a big city controlled by Democratic officials would ever allow that to happen in east Texas, west Texas, south Texas, north Texas. But in our big cities, yes, they will hire foreign firms, as they have, or firms funded by foreign money. They will hire them.

But they should not be, number one, connected to internet, should not ever be susceptible of foreign ability to access information, which means also to manipulate information if they are good hackers. And just as I said in 2001, back when I was a felony judge in Texas and Congress overstepped what was appropriate and ordered that every county in America had to give up what system of voting, no matter how effective and appropriate and protected it was, and all by electronic voting machines, it costs, seemed like \$2 billion or so dollars. It was an unfunded mandate. But worse to me is someone who worked in our county courthouse—I said back in 2001, this means because of Congress' inappropriate bill they passed, that eventually elections will go to the best—the person with the best hacker. And now, 19 years later, that is what we have.

Mr. Speaker, but it wasn't just hacking. It was also manipulation that

wasn't hacking. There were doors to which electronic experts could go to manipulate things. It was creating fraudulent ballots. It was—also, as I recall, the Texas constitution itself requires that ballots to be numbered sequentially, and I don't believe that has been done in quite some time.

So Texas, even though President Trump won and we picked up Republican seats there, I would submit it would be potentially even better results if we had ballots that comported with the Texas constitution. And I would submit that everybody ought to be having sequentially numbered ballots just to protect the election and voting process.

“In its press release, Amistad Project director, Phil Kline, said the testimonies are ‘compelling.’”

You see, testimony means things that were said under oath, which means it is evidence. It is a foundation for the claims of election fraud.

“This evidence joins with unlawful conduct by State and local election officials, including accepting millions of dollars of private funds, to undermine the integrity of this election, Kline said.” In this press release, the Amistad Project says it has collected sworn expert testimony alleging that “over 300,000 ballots are at issue in Arizona, 548,000 in Michigan, 204,000 in Georgia, and over 121,000 in Pennsylvania.”

And in case there is wondering about whether or not that would affect the election, that would absolutely affect the election in each of those states.

The story from PJ Media, Tyler O'Neal, December 1, again, talks about the truck driver that testified—which means it was under oath and it is evidence—“He had driven thousands of ballots from Bethpage, New York, to Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 2 weeks before Election Day. Phil Kline, a former attorney general of Kansas and director of the Amistad Project of the Thomas More Society, said that the Amistad Project corroborated the truck driver's story.”

So that is evidence.

This story by Jim Hoft: “Colonel Phil Waldron”—that I believe he has some former NSA folks that work with him—“tells Michigan lawmakers truckloads of ballots for Joe Biden were inserted into the Michigan 2020 election.”

Colonel Phil Waldron spoke tonight—this is dated December 2—at a Michigan hearing following his explosive testimony in Arizona on Monday on the voting machines used in U.S. elections. The Dominion systems were connected to the internet as well, despite Dominion's claims to the contrary.

And that also—let me insert here—that also helps explains the U.S. Government's director that was suppose to have been protecting our election, cybersecurity, making sure it was secured. There was a puff piece done on the director of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Association—or agency. Krebs was his name, Christopher Krebs. He had indicated in an

article on Election Day that he wanted to thank his partners in Silicon Valley. And he was also grateful—I am sure he had someone in Dominion advising him, but Krebs said everything is good because he talked to people that might have been involved in the fraud and they assured him everything was good. So he said everything was good.

Also, with our Attorney General Barr, he said he had seen no evidence of fraud. And there are others that have said the same thing. And I would humbly submit that all you have to do is close your eyes, stick your fingers in your ear, and sing “la la la” for a long period of time. Keep it up and you will neither see nor hear any evidence of fraud.

So if our Attorney General can keep that up, then he will continue not to see or hear any evidence of fraud. So, hopefully, he has not been listening to what I have had to say here in the House because, here, again, it would cause him to demand to see and hear the actual evidence, and he may not want to do that so he can stay consistent.

But the evidence is there. It is evidence. It is sworn. And as this article points out:

According to Waldron, the United States has a copy of the traffic and the packets of information that were sent to Germany on election night.

Yesterday, the first expert at the Arizona State Legislature hearing with Rudy Giuliani was U.S. cybersecurity expert, Colonel Phil Waldron.

And Phil is an impressive man, an impressive person when it comes to cybersecurity.

□ 1515

“Colonel Phil Waldron spoke first at the Arizona hearing about the voting machines used in the U.S. election. The Dominion systems were connected to the internet as well, despite Dominion's claims to the contrary. The records within the system can be manipulated by outside parties and insiders as well.

“On Wednesday night, Colonel Waldron told the committee that they have witnesses now who delivered truckloads of ballots for Joe Biden from New York to Pennsylvania. Waldron said they likely did the same thing in Wisconsin.

“Waldron explained that Democrats inserted truckloads of fraudulent ballots into the fraudulent 2020 election.”

Many people saw the video from Georgia that was played yesterday, last evening. This article from The Gateway Pundit, December 3, says: “Earlier today Cristina Laila reported on the explosive video that was revealed during the Georgia ballot counting at the State Farm Arena where crooked Democrats pulled out suitcases full of ballots and began counting these ballots without election monitors in the room.

“Trump's legal team showed a video from the State Farm Arena tabulation center when poll workers were told to leave at 10:25 p.m.



“A few ‘workers’ stayed behind and were seen pulling suitcases of full of ballots out from under tables to be tabulated.”

So that seems strange, if you believe that the mainstream media never reports anything but facts, because you can, as I did yesterday, go online and put into Google anything about vote counting being suspended during election night. All of the first entries you get tell you that it was fact-checked; it is not true; it is fraudulent representation. It is not true; there was never any suspension of vote counting for any time in the swing States.

In other words, even though you heard it and you saw it happening on TV, don't believe your lying eyes and ears; believe what we tell you, because we are coming to you through the internet, so you can trust us, but don't trust your lying eyes or ears.

Anyway, in that video, it is very clear, they did pull out suitcases full of ballots that were—whether intentional or not, they were hidden under tables, and they weren't pulled out until after the monitors and the other vote counters were ordered to leave, that they were stopping the vote counting, and they did leave. That is when the ballots come out from under the table and the counting of those ballots begins. It is absolutely extraordinary.

But some of us have known that this kind of activity has been going on. We know that there were electronic manipulations in Dallas County in 2018. It is really unfortunate. Our Texas Attorney General had a chance to be a national hero, had they stepped in, utilized evidence from there. And I have heard people say, Well, I heard about that. There was really nothing to that.

Well, I have been following that for two years and trying to get people in law enforcement to do something about it. But they avoided the chance to be a national hero and refused to go after the fraud that existed in the 2018 primary and general election in Dallas County, again, by a firm that had foreign money supporting it, and they did the counting for Dallas County. But since nothing was done there, then the people were free to continue that type of operation in the national election.

Here is an article from Joel Pollak. “Attorneys Sidney Powell and Lin Wood told a rally in Atlanta, Georgia . . . Republicans should not vote in the January 5 runoff election for U.S. Senate unless State authorities rectify problems in the State's voting system.”

And I haven't talked to Lin Wood or Sidney Powell about that, but I would imagine, knowing them, that they were trying to make the point that this system needs to be cleaned up before the election on January 5, because we do need people to vote in that election—not multiple times, but legally; not people come in and illegally vote, but people vote legally as to who they want to represent them in the U.S. Senate.

So here is a story from the Epoch Times, Christina Kim, November 28:

“The complaint against Michigan's Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson and Governor Gretchen Whitmer, marks the beginning of Powell's lawsuit against the State.

“Some of the allegations are repeated claims from Michigan and other States. Republican challengers were unable to ‘meaningfully observe,’ and workers were instructed to backdate ballots.

“Other claims are newer.

“Expert witness, Russell James Ramsland, Jr., works with the Allied Security Operations Group. In the past, he has worked with NASA and MIT.

“Ramsland said there were four ‘physically impossible’ ‘spikes totaling almost 385,000 ballots allegedly processed in a combined interval of 2 hours and 38 minutes.’ He concluded that ‘Dominion alone is responsible for the injection, or fabrication, of 290,000 illegal votes in Michigan that must be disregarded.’ This is nearly twice the number of ballots by which Biden is leading Trump, which is approximately 150,000 ballots.

“Dr. David Keshavarz-Nia has a Ph.D. in engineering and technology and received advanced training from the CIA, NSA and DHS. In his sworn statement . . .”—and again, since it is a sworn statement, it means the allegations are not unfounded and there is evidence of what is alleged—“‘that USB memory cards were used to facilitate administrative’ backdoor access ‘to disrupt polling operations and impact ballot counting across Michigan, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Arizona and Wisconsin.’

“He also said, after a detailed analysis of the New York Times data, in his expert judgment, ‘the vote count distribution in Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Michigan, Arizona, Nevada, and Georgia, are not based on normal system operation. Instead, they are caused by fraudulent electronic manipulation of the targeted voting machines.’

“Another affidavit was submitted by someone whose name and personal information was redacted. This person was an electronic intelligence analyst with extensive experience as a white hat hacker used by some of the top election specialists in the world.

“The expert alleged that a search of Edison Research showed they had an Iranian server and there are records showing China accessing Dominion Voting's servers.” Wow. “Edison Research reports the vote count tabulation to Decision Desk HQ for election results.

“According to the affidavit, the digital forensics analysis shows there is ‘unambiguous evidence that Dominion Voter Systems and Edison Research have been accessible and were certainly compromised by rogue actors, such as Iran and China.’”

Now, this is an area that does require expertise, and that is why you need experts to come in and testify about it. It is true that simply making a statement under oath in an area that re-

quires expertise may not be considered evidence until a judge—going back to the Merrell Dow decision of the U.S. Supreme Court—the judge became the gatekeeper, had to make inquiries of the expert outside the hearing of the jury, and determine whether or not this person was expert in an area in which he was proffered as a witness, and if the judge so finds, then that is, indeed, sworn evidence before the court.

“The complaint asks the Court to provide emergency relief to de-certify Wayne County's results, stop Benson and Whitmer from transmitting the State's certifications to the Electoral College, and ‘to transmit certified election results that President Donald Trump is the winner of the election’ in Michigan, among other requests.

“Michigan's Senate Committee is set to meet next Tuesday, December 1, to hear testimony about absentee ballot counting at Detroit's TCF center.”

You know, this is a matter that should be thoroughly investigated by all areas of the Government, the three branches of Government, including—for those who we are told are recent college graduates that know the Three Stooges' names better than the three branches of Government—it is the executive branch, from the President all the way down; the legislative branch, including Congress and the Senate; and also the judiciary branch, where you would ultimately come to have judicial decisions made over these things.

Those are all important. We all ought to be investigating this. It is part of our job as Members of Congress. That is what we need to be doing.

Yet, it is worth noting—and I think important to note—that as we heard the majority leader talking about concerns about COVID and businesses going bankrupt and not being able to operate and, of course, the unconstitutional shutdown of churches, where the Government does prohibit the free exercise of religion, those matters should concern everybody and especially about who you place as your servant in the Government.

But we hear the words from some people in this body about how critical it is that we do something about COVID. One of the first things we should have done—we had over \$120 billion that was unused that was authorized and appropriated in the original Payroll Protection Program. It is just sitting there. All we have got to do is say yes, go back and allow that to be used by businesses in trouble under the same conditions, or we can modify them, and we have a bill.

And Republicans have been, We don't care. Put a Democrat name on there. That is fine. Let's just do it to help businesses avoid going out of business. Instead, what we took up was the tiger bill. We took that up pretty quick this week.

And as my friend, Dr. DESJARLAIS, pointed out, if you look at the time that we spent in here voting on the

tiger bill, that, as I understand, only pertains to one place that keeps tigers, that during that period we voted on the tiger bill, there have been more people die of COVID than have died from tigers over the last 25 years. Yet, we rush in here to do the tiger bill.

I know there is a lot of use, metaphorically, of the red pill/blue pill from *The Third Eye* or *The Matrix*. And it is intriguing. You know, the red pill is supposed to show you truth, what is really going on, and the blue pill, you will just be in blissful ignorance. I couldn't help but be reminded of that.

When we are in here, we are not passing anything to help with COVID, not to help businesses going out of business. We are passing what ought to be called the blue pill law. We are not going to fix your problems, but we are hoping you will smoke dope so that you can—marijuana. So we are—I didn't vote for it—but appropriating a bunch of money to make marijuana more accessible, not for medicinal purposes—a lot of us are okay with that—but for widespread recreational use.

So that if you are bothered—whether it is seeing an election stolen or seeing your business go bankrupt, because the Government won't let you open, or seeing your church being closed and the preacher being taken down for someone who failed to wear a mask—smoke some dope. That is the message of the week. And that is what we did this week.

So that is the message from the majority. Go smoke some dope, take the blue pill, and you will enjoy life so much more.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward Members of the Senate or the President, including by repeating remarks made elsewhere that would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 967, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday, December 7, 2020.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 7, 2020, at noon.

#### OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Member executed the oath for access to classified information:

Kwanza Hall

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-5782. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's interim final rule — Margin Requirements for Uncleared Swaps for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants [RIN: 3038-AF02] received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-5783. A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Affairs, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — Position Limits for Derivatives (RIN: 3038-AD99) received December 2, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-5784. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Defense Acquisition Regulations System, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Major interim rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Assessing Contractor Implementation of Cybersecurity Requirements (DFARS Case 2019-D041) [Docket DARS-2020-0034] (RIN: 0750-AJ81) received December 2, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5785. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Transparency in Coverage (RIN: 1210-AB93) received November 17, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC-5786. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Financial Factors in Selecting Plan Investments (RIN: 1210-AB95) received November 17, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC-5787. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Chemical Recovery Combustion Sources at Kraft, Soda, Sulfite, and Stand-Alone Semichemical Pulp Mills; Standards of Performance for Kraft Pulp Mill Affected Sources for Which Construction, Reconstruction, or Modification Commenced After May 23, 2013 [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0741; FRL-10015-72-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AU53) received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5788. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Approval and Partial Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Arizona; Nonattainment Plan for the Hayden SO<sub>2</sub> Nonattainment Area [EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0109; FRL-10014-84-Region 9] received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5789. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiamine Mononitrate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0112; FRL-10015-69] received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5790. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trinexapac-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0046; FRL-10012-51] received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5791. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Revisions to Emissions Reporting Requirements [EPA-R02-OAR-2019-0681; FRL-10014-13-Region 2] received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5792. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Calcium Pantothenate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0117; FRL-10015-71] received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5793. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Findings of Failure To Submit State Implementation Plans Required for Attainment of the 2010 1-Hour Primary Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) [EPA-HQ-OAR-2020-0377; FRL-10015-79-OAR] received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5794. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; South Coast Moderate Area Plan and Reclassification as Serious Nonattainment for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0145; FRL-10015-43-Region 9] received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5795. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; Attainment Plan for the Indiana, Pennsylvania Nonattainment Area for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0615; FRL-10015-78-Region 3] received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5796. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Connecticut; Control of Particulate Matter and Visible Emissions [EPA-R01-OAR-2020-0255; FRL-10013-47-Region 1] received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5797. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Volatile Organic Compounds [EPA-R05-OAR-2019-0302; EPA-R05-OAR-2019-0676; FRL-10015-49-Region 5] received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5798. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Information Blocking and the ONC Health IT Certification Program: Extension of Compliance Dates and Timeframes in Response to the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency (RIN: 0955-AA02) received November 24, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5799. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — 21st Century Cures Act: Interoperability, Information Blocking, and the ONC Health IT Certification Program (RIN: 0955-AA01) received November 24, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-5800. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-5801. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-5802. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-5803. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of The President, transmitting the Office's report on Other U.S. Contributions to the United Nations for FY 2018, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 287b-1(a); Public Law 114-323, Sec. 312(a); (130 Stat. 1925); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-5804. A letter from the Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2020 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-5805. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress, covering the period ending September 30, 2020; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-5806. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended covering the period of April 1, 2020, through September 30, 2020; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-5807. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Ad-

ministration, transmitting the Administration's FY 2020 Performance and Accountability Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-5808. A letter from the Chairman of the Board and Chairman of the Audit Committee, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's report addressing the requirements of the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-5809. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual inventory of commercial of activities performed by federal government sources, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-5810. A letter from the Chair, United States International Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Agency Financial Report for FY 2020, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-5811. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Income Tax Withholding From Wages [TD 9924] (RIN: 1545-B032) received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-5812. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's Major final rule — Meals and Entertainment Expenses Under Section 274 [TD 9925] (RIN: 1545-BP23) received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-5813. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Income Tax Withholding on Certain Periodic Retirement and Annuity Payments Under Section 3405(a) [TD 9920] (RIN: 1545-BP69) received November 4, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-5814. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report titled, "Supplemental Benefits to Treat or Prevent Substance Use Disorders under Medicare Advantage Plans", pursuant to Public Law 115-271, Sec. 6084(a); (132 Stat. 3995); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

EC-5815. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicare Program; Modernizing and Clarifying the Physician Self-Referral Regulations [CMS-1720-F] (RIN: 0938-AT64) received December 2, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

EC-5816. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Organ Procurement Organizations Conditions for Coverage: Revisions to the Outcome Measure Requirements for

Organ Procurement Organizations [CMS-3380-F] (RIN: 0938-AU02) received December 2, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

EC-5817. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major interim final rule — Most Favored Nation (MFN) Model [CMS-5528-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AT91) received November 24, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. STEUBE, and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H.R. 8870. A bill to repeal the National Voter Registration Act of 1993; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. PORTER, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 8871. A bill to provide for an emergency increase in Federal funding to State Medicaid programs for expenditures on home and community-based services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH (for himself and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 8872. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to enable captive insurance companies to apply for membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank System, to add additional membership criteria for captive insurance companies, to require a study on Federal Home Loan Bank membership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 8873. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to modify requirements relating to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLER (for himself and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 8874. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide flexibility in training and competency requirements for skilled nursing facility and nursing facility nursing aides under the Medicare and Medicaid programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 8875. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of

1974 to establish a special enrollment periods for eligible individuals who are enrolled in non-compliant health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 8876. A bill to authorize the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to reclassify the GS-1801 ICE Tactical Officers in the Homeland Security Investigations (HSI) tactical patrol unit operating on the Native American Tohono O'odham Nation (commonly known as the "Shadow Wolves") as GS-1811 ICE Homeland Security Investigations Special Agents, to amend the Native American Hiring preference granted to the Department of Homeland Security in support of the Shadow Wolves program to modify the job series and title for newly hired Shadow Wolves from GS-1801 ICE Tactical Officers to GS-1811 ICE HSI Special Agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 8877. A bill to make an emergency additional appropriation to carry out the Head Start Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 8878. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to purchase goods or services from Communist Chinese military companies; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 8879. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide credits for the production of renewable chemicals and investments in renewable chemical production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CASE, and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 8880. A bill to establish the Compassionate Capitalist Award to recognize organizations that substantially benefit the well-being of their employees, stakeholders, and communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCANLON (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 8881. A bill to provide grants to States that do not suspend, revoke, or refuse to renew a driver's license of a person or refuse to renew a registration of a motor vehicle for failure to pay a civil or criminal fine or fee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 8882. A bill to establish a national integrated flood information system within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HURD of Texas (for himself, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 1250. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the principles that should guide the national artificial intelligence strategy of the United States; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Oversight and Reform, Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-214. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 190, urging Congress and the President to enact legislation that provides additional emergency response funding to support the costs of safely reopening schools following the COVID-19; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ML-215. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 234, memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal the federal ban on Pell Grants for prison-based education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ML-216. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 323, discouraging Congress from expanding the size of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ML-217. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 86, respectfully memorializing Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide Medicare coverage for eyeglasses, hearing aids, and dentures; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 8870.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 8871.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 8872.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 8873.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KELLER:

H.R. 8874.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 2, Clause 18

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 8875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 8876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 4 of the Constitution

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 8877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 8878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 8879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 8880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18—Congress shall have the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 8881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 8882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 or Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1155: Mr. TRONE and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 2428: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3316: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3637: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 3711: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 4022: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4914: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 5531: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 6703: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 6745: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 6909: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 6958: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 7052: Mr. ROUDA and Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 7197: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 7308: Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 7806: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 7976: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 8058: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 8242: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 8254: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 8270: Mr. HAGEDORN and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 8354: Mr. NADLER and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 8368: Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 8380: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 8433: Mr. LAMB, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 8485: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 8662: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 8702: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KIM, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 8711: Mr. PERRY and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 8745: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 8769: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 8774: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 8778: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 8791: Ms. NORTON and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 8801: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 8812: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 8820: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 8830: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 8834: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 8840: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H. J. Res. 8: Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H. J. Res. 104: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H. Res. 1201: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 1213: Mr. CASE.

H. Res. 1222: Mr. HARDER of California.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

PT-150. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, CA, relative to Resolution No. 518-20, condemning the hostile military attacks escalating the conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia; affirming support of House Resolution 1165, authored by Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER; and urging the United States to help broker a peaceful resolution and return to a ceasefire agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PT-151. Also, a petition of the mayor and City Commission of Miami Beach, FL, relative to Resolution No. 2020-31414, affirming support for and a partnership with federal, state, and local leaders to ensure an accurate 2020 U.S. Census; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

PT-152. Also, a petition of the Mayor and City Commission of Miami Beach, FL, relative to Resolution No. 2020-31413, requesting that the U.S. Congress pass legislation providing direct funding assistance to all cities to help mitigate expenditures and current and future losses as a result of the Novel Coronavirus ("COVID-19") Pandemic; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

PT-153. Also, a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, NY, relative to Resolution No. 417 of 2020, support of the United States Postal Service and its workers and demanding that adequate funding, staffing and processing infrastructure be restored to handle mail-in ballots for the November 2020 election and beyond; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

PT-154. Also, a petition of the Senate of the Government of Puerto Rico, relative to

Senate Resolution 1378, to express the rejection of the Senate of Puerto Rico to H.R. 8113 of the United States House of Representatives, for this legislation disregards and interferes with the right to self-determination of the voters of Puerto Rico; perpetuates the antidemocratic territory status by suggesting that there may be a non-territorial status other than statehood, independence, or a nation associated with the United States, et al; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

PT-155. Also, a petition of the Electors of the Town of Newbold, WI, relative to Resolution No. 2020-1, seeking to reclaim democracy from the expansion of corporate personhood rights and the corrupting influence of unregulated political contributions and spending; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PT-156. Also, a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, NY, relative to Resolution No. 452 of 2020, opposing the Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (MTA) plan to eliminate rail service west of the Hudson and calling upon the Federal Government to provide the much-needed funding; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PT-157. Also, a petition of the Mayor and City Commission of Miami Beach, FL, relative to Resolution No. 2020-31411, supporting House Bill H.R. 3872 and its related Bill, Senate Bill S. 2187 and urging the U.S. Congress to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance program; and further urging Congress to provide additional resources to FEMA to utilize the best technology and methods available to improve the flood mapping process; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Transportation and Infrastructure.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF FRED HAMPTON

**HON. BOBBY L. RUSH**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, you can kill the revolutionary, but you cannot kill the revolution. These were the words my late comrade and best friend Fred Hampton, the Chairman and co-founder of the Illinois Chapter of the Black Panther Party spoke and lived by. In a year that has seen too many Black lives unjustly taken, Chairman Fred's words, life, and legacy remain just as vital to our understanding of justice today as they were on the date of his assassination on December 4, 1969.

Chairman Fred was both a visionary and a revolutionary, who fought for a more just world for everyone. I had the distinct privilege of recruiting and working alongside Fred during our righteous struggle for the liberation and emancipation of the people who had been ignored by those in power for far too long. We encouraged community development and empowerment through programs that included community health clinics and an expansive free breakfast for children program, finally delivering critical social services to long underserved communities. We also helped broker a peace agreement between Chicago's street gangs, reducing violence in the city's most marginalized neighborhoods.

Furthermore, the Illinois Chapter of the Black Panther Party joined forces with the Latino Young Lords organization, and the Young Patriots, an organization of poor whites living in Chicago's Uptown community. Together, we formed the original Rainbow Coalition to fight all economic oppression. This watershed organization assembled a working-class coalition to fight for our shared interests, despite the fact that we were working in one of the most segregated cities in the United States. We banded together to fight many of the issues that still plague us to this very day, including police brutality, substandard housing, mediocre education, and low-quality health care.

In the early hours of December 4th, 51 years ago, the Chicago Police Department with the cooperation, coordination, and support of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Cook County State's Attorney entered an apartment on West Monroe Street that seven members of the Black Panther Party were staying in, with the premeditated aim of murdering Fred Hampton. The police immediately opened fire, killing Fred as he lay in his bed alongside his pregnant girlfriend, Akua Njeri. Our fellow Black Panther Party Member Mark Clark was also killed in the raid. There but for the grace of God, on that dreadful night, go I. In fact, my apartment was raided during the early hours the very next morning, December 5, 1969.

Madam Speaker, through meticulous work we were able to prove that the official nar-

rative of that night, that Hampton and Clark were killed in a vicious firelight, was entirely a falsehood. The police and State's Attorney claimed that they engaged in a fierce battle with the Panthers, but investigators were able to determine that the police fired 99 bullets while the Panthers only fired one.

A civil lawsuit would further reveal that the FBI's Counter-Intelligence Program, or COINTELPRO, helped plan the murder of Fred Hampton. William O'Neil, an FBI informant within the Party, provided floor plans of the apartment to the FBI, who provided them to the State's Attorney and Chicago Police Department. An autopsy found a massive dose of the barbiturate Seconal in Chairman Fred's bloodstream, powerful enough to sedate an elephant. J. Edgar Hoover's FBI viewed the Black Panther Party movement Fred and I helped start to liberate our brothers and sisters who were suffering from divestment, lack of health care, and police brutality—as the number one threat to the national security of America.

This country's government planned the assassination—the political assassination—of one of our nation's brightest young leaders. To my recollection, the murder of Fred Hampton is the only time federal law enforcement conspired to carry out the political assassination of an American citizen on United States soil, a truly shameful moment in the history of our country. This was a systemic campaign to violently disrupt a movement seeking justice and freedom for the most marginalized among us. This should remind all of us that Black lives have never been fully valued by many of those in this country's power structures. Too often, justice is not sought for the families of those whose lives are senselessly taken by the state.

Madam Speaker, when the South Side of Chicago's very own Ida B. Wells published her seminal investigative journalism on lynching in America, she found that many lynchings occurred because the victims posed a threat to the white supremacist status quo. One of her best friends was killed for merely operating a successful grocery store that competed with neighboring white businesses. While the killings Ida B. Wells examined were not political assassinations like the murder of Fred Hampton, they share a common thread. Both challenged the white supremacist status quo in their communities.

Fred Hampton profoundly challenged this status quo by fiercely advocating for economic and social dignity for all people, and by providing long overdue social services to the most neglected communities in Chicago. Fred Hampton's challenge to the status quo proposed nothing less than a demand for full civil rights and economic opportunity for all those whose talents, dreams, and goals had long been stifled. This was a scary proposition to those like State's Attorney Hanrahan and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who would stop at nothing to maintain the unjust status quo that prevailed in Chicago and throughout the United States in December of 1969. Fred

Hampton gave his life to help create a more fundamentally fair and equal nation for every American, consistent with our nation's founding principles.

Sadly, Madam Speaker, too often it appears that for Black Americans merely existing can be seen as a challenge to the white, racist power structure. And sadly, as Ida B. Wells found in 1892, the consequences can be just as gruesome. Ahmaud Arbery was 25 years old when he was gunned down for merely jogging in what his killers deemed to be the wrong neighborhood. Despite this incident taking place in February of this year, and a video being available, neither of the men now charged with the murder of Ahmaud Arbery were arrested until May. If not for a report by The New York Times that helped lead to the Georgia Bureau of Investigation's intervention in the matter, Mr. Arbery's killers may never have faced justice.

Ahmaud Arbery's death was a lynching, which occurred because two white men felt uncomfortable with his jogging through their neighborhood. One of the most recent in far too long a line of lynch mob killings of Black people in the United States.

Madam Speaker, Congress must act promptly to ensure that no one who participates in such acts of terror and hatred can escape justice. As introduced, my bill, the Emmett Till Anti-lynching Act, would designate lynching as federal hate crime. This would apply whether or not those committing the offense were acting under the color of law. By designating lynching as a federal hate crime, the United States Department of Justice and Federal Bureau of Investigation would be compelled to investigate a case like Ahmaud Arbery's.

The Emmett Till Anti-lynching Act honors the legacy of Emmett Till, who was brutally murdered in Money, Mississippi, in 1955. His death helped spark this country's civil rights movement, but his murderers never faced justice, as they were acquitted at a sham trial in Tallahatchie County, Mississippi. Passing the Emmett Till Anti-lynching Act would ensure that the full force of the United States Federal Government is always brought to prosecute those who commit the monstrous act of lynching.

We have the opportunity to finally, after 120 years and 200 attempts since Congressman George Henry White of North Carolina introduced the first anti-lynching legislation, make lynching a federal crime. In fact, Ida B. Wells herself advocated for the administration of President William McKinley to push for anti-lynching reforms all the way back in 1898. Passage of the Emmett Till Anti-lynching Act into law would demonstrate that this country understands the heinous legacy of lynching and begin the process of finally closing this shameful chapter of our history.

Madam Speaker, let us never forget the courage, conviction, and compassion of Fred Hampton. Despite this government assassinating him at only 21 years of age, Chairman Fred's work and legacy are everlasting. Let

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



our work in Congress be guided by his legacy of pursuing freedom and justice for all people. That work can begin by sending the Emmet Till Anti-lynching Act to the President's desk, an act that would require action by our colleagues in the Senate. That would be a clear demonstration that Congress has begun to value the Black lives, including Fred Hampton's, Emmett Till's, Ahmaud Arbery's, and the countless others whose lives have been systematically devalued for far too long.

HONORING STATE SENATOR TOM CASPERSON

**HON. ELISSA SLOTKIN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Speaker, yesterday, my colleagues, Representatives JACK BERGMAN and TOM TIFFANY, paid tribute on the House floor to former state senator and servant leader for Michigan's Upper Peninsula, Mr. Tom Casperson. Today, I rise to do the same. On November 29, Tom lost his battle with cancer, but throughout his life, he embodied many of the traits that our great state—and particularly our Upper Peninsula—is known for: hard work, fierce independence, and an undying devotion to the people of his community.

Born in Escanaba, Tom worked for his family's log trucking business for more than three decades, rising through the ranks from trucker to owner. He could have continued at the helm of his family's successful company. However, after a fatal accident involving a log-truck-industry colleague took the life of a young woman and her baby, Tom resolved to help implement safety measures for the industry so the tragedy would never repeat itself. When he realized that his best chance at making a difference was through the political process, he decided to run for office.

In 2002, Tom was elected to the Michigan House of Representatives. Just eight months after being sworn in, Tom made good on his first legislative priority when he passed legislation to require new safety measures in the log-trucking industry. This first public act he authored was followed by an incredible 117 additional bills passed into law during the 14 years that Tom served the Upper Peninsula—six years as the State Representative and eight years as State Senator.

Tom was a tenacious advocate for the Upper Peninsula and, in the days since his passing, tributes to his life have poured in from public officials on both sides of the aisle and across Michigan. On Wednesday, Governor Whitmer lowered our state's flags on the day of his funeral in his honor. In so many statements remembering his life, what shines through is his passion for doing the people's work and setting an example for future generations of public servants.

Tom's passing is felt particularly by my team because his son-in-law, Chan, is a Wounded Warrior Fellow in my office. Chan and his wife, Ashley, have shared with us what a wonderful and loving grandfather Tom was to their three children, especially how meaningful it was when Tom traveled the world to visit his grandchildren while Chan was stationed abroad with the U.S. Navy. I know that they will deeply miss their lengthy and substantive

political conversations that were always civil and informative.

At a time when consensus seems elusive, Tom was an example of what we can accomplish when we work together and find common ground. Today, I'm thinking of Tom's wife, Diane, of Chan and Ashley, Ashley's three siblings, and Tom's grandchildren. I hope it serves as a comfort for them to know that he left a profound mark on those who knew him, loved him, and served with him.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF WALTER K. ROBINSON, SR.

**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in remembering the life and legacy of Walter K. Robinson, Sr., a District of Columbia resident for over 50 years and a Documented Original Tuskegee Airman. Mr. Robinson died on November 23, 2020, his 100th birthday. Mr. Robinson will be remembered by his family, friends and the East Coast Chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen, of which he was an active member.

In 1941, while attending Howard University, Mr. Robinson volunteered for the Army Air Corps. He was sent to Camp Lee in Virginia, Keesler Field in Biloxi, Mississippi and finally to Tuskegee Army Air Base in Tuskegee, Alabama. He began training at Tuskegee Institute for Basic Ground School and, after three months, continued in Pre-Flight, Primary, Basic and Advanced Flight. During Primary Training, he had an accident, severing his Achilles tendon, and was hospitalized for almost a year, enduring six operations and extensive physical therapy. Yet, Mr. Robinson completed Primary, Lower, and Upper Basic Training, and while he was in Lower Advanced, World War II ended. After his honorable discharge from the military, Mr. Robinson and his wife, Edmonia, moved to D.C. in 1959. He soon joined the Postal Service and rose through the ranks to become the second Black Manager of Delivery and Collection for the District.

I had the immense honor of hosting Mr. Robinson at my office in 2017, where I presented him with a bronze replica of the Tuskegee Airmen Congressional Gold Medal. Mr. Robinson is emblematic of the many D.C. residents who have heroically sacrificed so much for their country, even without their full citizenship rights. I am proud to have been able to honor his service.

Tuskegee Airmen like Mr. Robinson did more than protect America from foreign enemies during World War II; they saved America from itself, defying the gross misconception that African Americans were not capable of flying and fighting as equal servicemembers. The accomplishments of these brave servicemembers helped pave the way for President Harry Truman's decision to integrate the military in 1948. Their service to this country and as history-shapers was recognized in 2007 when 300 members of the Tuskegee Airmen, including Mr. Robinson, received the Congressional Gold Medal.

I ask the House of Representatives to join me in remembering the life and legacy of Walter K. Miller, Sr.

IN HONOR OF CAPTAIN (RETIRED) WILLIAM EISENHART

**HON. JOHN JOYCE**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Captain (Retired) William Eisenhart of Altoona, Pennsylvania, who courageously served our nation in the U.S. Army.

During his fifteen-year military career, Captain Eisenhart served with distinction. While he was stationed in Vietnam from November 1967 to October 1968, Captain Eisenhart served as a Senior Advisor to forces in Tan Thanh Dong Province. In this role, he moved his advisory team into a dilapidated fortress located on strategic territory. Captain Eisenhart and his team are credited with making several critical improvements to the fortress that helped the United States forces, including the installation of a helipad that allowed the Army to facilitate medical evacuations in Thanh Dong Province. Holding this outpost was a challenge. On June 6, 1968, Captain Eisenhart was instrumental in repelling a superior enemy force when he fired a machine gun into the center of the enemy's line of attack, which allowed U.S. forces to effectively build up a defensive operation.

The fortress that Captain Eisenhart defended was a critical outpost in the Phu Hoa District for deterring enemy movement. For this extraordinary accomplishment, he was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with a "V" device and one Oak Leaf Cluster. In recognition of his service, Captain Eisenhart also was awarded the Army Good Conduct Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal with One Silver Service Star, and a Meritorious Unit Commendation with one Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster.

With his incredible legacy of selfless service, Captain (Retired) William Eisenhart exemplifies our American values. He is an outstanding American and Pennsylvanian, and it is my privilege to recognize his many achievements. On behalf of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, I thank Captain (Retired) Eisenhart for his dedication to our nation, our Commonwealth, and our community.

BIG CAT PUBLIC SAFETY ACT

SPEECH OF

**HON. RON ESTES**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 3, 2020*

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, the House is set to vote on the Big Cat Public Safety Act. Sadly, my Democratic colleagues are pushing legislation inspired by a reality show feud instead of focusing on the harsh realities that real life families are facing because of the coronavirus pandemic.

Madam Speaker, this bill does more harm than good for the very animals it seeks to protect. My district is home to Tanganyika Wildlife Park in Goddard, Kansas. It's owner, Jim Fouts, founded this park in 2008 to conserve endangered tiger species and educate visitors through interactive experiences.

Through its current operation, Tanganyika Wildlife Park has become one of the top big

cat breeding facilities, among 37 across the United States, for conservation. This legislation discriminates against smaller facilities that have safely worked to increase populations for rare and Endangered species.

Additionally, like many other small conservation facilities, Tanganyika Wildlife Park was built privately with no government grants or funding. The Big Cat Public Safety Act is not about public safety; instead, it eliminates smaller operations that are saving animals' lives while also providing unique educational experiences in communities across the country.

Instead of fixing a problem, Democrats have once again introduced a one-size-fits-all bill that hurts smaller facilities instead of addressing problems with some bad actors. And they've abdicated their responsibility to lead the People's House in a bipartisan manner when so many families and small businesses are hurting.

It is ridiculous that we are voting on this bill rather than passing meaningful, common-sense measures to provide relief to Americans during our public health crisis.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

##### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I was not present to vote on passage of H.R. 1380 on Thursday December 3, 2020. I wish to reflect my intentions had I been present to vote.

Had I been present for roll call No. 232 on passage of H.R. 1380, the Big Cat Public Safety Act, I would have voted YEA.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

##### HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. DeFAZIO. Madam Speaker, on December 3, I was unable to vote due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted: on Roll Call Vote Number 229, On the Motion to Adjourn, I would have voted Nay; on Roll Call Vote Number 230, On Ordering the Previous Question to H. Res. 1244, I would have voted Aye; on Roll Call Vote Number 231, On Agreeing to the Resolution H. Res. 1244, I would have voted Aye; and on Roll Call Vote Number 232, On the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 1380, the Big Cat Public Safety Act, I would have voted Aye.

RECOGNIZING COMMANDER MICHAEL YUNKER AND HIS DEDICATED SERVICE TO OUR GREAT NATION

##### HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I'm honored to recognize Commander Michael Yunker for

his impeccable and tireless service to our great Country, upon his retirement on December 1, 2020, after 20 years of service in the United States Navy.

Commander Yunker is the Operations Officer for the Navy Customer Facing Division, Customer Operations Directorate, Defense Logistics Agency Aviation. Previously, he served as the Division's Director of Industrial Support and Naval Aviation Enterprise Action Officer. He has been a member of the DLA workforce since January 2018.

Commander Yunker is a native of Aston, Pennsylvania. He earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Criminal Justice from Radford University, a Master of Arts in National Security and Strategic Studies—to include an Operational Planner Certificate from the U.S. Naval War College—and a Master of Public Administration from the Pennsylvania State University. He is also a member of the Navy Acquisition Professional Community and is a Joint Specialty Officer. Commander Yunker's operational tours include: Principal Assistant for Services and Stock Control Officer; USS Enterprise (CVN 65); Assistant Supply Officer, USS Ashland (LSD 48); and Base Command Group, Multi-National Forces-West Base Fuels and Environmental Compliance Officer, al-Asad, Iraq.

As an Operations Officer, Commander Yunker's daily focus is centered around operations for the near-and long-term readiness and sustainment of 21 various naval aviation airframe models and 11 nuclear aircraft carriers. He serves as the initial point of contact for all inquiries supporting naval air stations and nuclear aircraft carriers globally. He assists the senior naval officer with service-related administrative tasks, to include: awards; fitness reports and evaluations; detailing; and any other duties as assigned/required.

Commander Yunker's prior shore assignments include: Director, Strategic Planning/Internal Review, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition, Washington, D.C.; Joint Petroleum Officer and Logistics Planner, U.S. Strategic Command, Omaha, Nebraska; Midshipmen Disbursing Officer/Financial Advisor, Midshipmen Services Officer and Adjunct Instructor, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis; and Director, New Construction Outfitting and In-Service Platform Manager Surface Ships, Naval Supply Systems Command Weapon Systems Support, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania. Commander Yunker's military awards and recognitions include, but are not limited to: the Defense Meritorious Service Medal; Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal (five awards); Joint Service Achievement Medal; Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal (two awards); and various campaign and unit awards.

Upon retirement, Commander Yunker plans to start a second career in addition to spending more time with his family.

Madam Speaker, I'm humbled to recognize Commander Michael Yunker and, on behalf of the Citizens of the 10th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, thank him for his decades of dedicated and selfless service to our great Nation both in times of peace and war.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

##### HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, on roll call vote 229, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on the motion to adjourn.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF KAREN BIRD, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE ALLIANCE OF DEDICATED CANCER CENTERS

##### HON. KATHERINE M. CLARK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Karen Bird, Executive Director of the Alliance of Dedicated Cancer Centers (ADCC). As Executive Director, Karen represented the country's leading cancer centers whose one and only mission is to defeat cancer. She worked tirelessly to communicate to Congress and the Administration the importance of the ADCC member institutions and what they do to improve patient treatment and to drive innovative cancer research. Thanks in large part to Karen's efforts, patients now have greater access to lifesaving treatments such as CAR-T cell therapies.

Prior to her work at the ADCC, Karen was Chief Financial Officer at the renowned Dana-Farber Cancer Institute where she succeeded in working with both physician leadership and senior executives to grow new ventures and programs. She developed a finance department that was considered best in class and was able to help Dana-Farber respond quickly to the 2008 financial crisis with an integrated financial forecasting model that encompassed endowment, research, and patient care.

Perhaps most importantly, Karen has generously served as a role model and mentor throughout her career, ensuring that the pipeline of talent in finance and especially for women—was amply filled and abundantly qualified.

It is a great honor to represent Karen Bird and her lifetime commitment to advancing our nation's understanding of the causes, prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and survival of cancer.

RECOGNIZING SUPERVISOR KARL RODEFER

##### HON. TOM McCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Karl Rodefer for his devoted service as a Tuolumne County Supervisor.

First, however, I want to acknowledge and thank Colonel Rodefer for his years of expert advice in nominating the very best young men

and women in the 4th Congressional District to our service academies. Himself a graduate of the United States Air Force Academy, his personal understanding of the critical requirements of military leadership has resulted in over 100 nominees succeeding at the academies and then as officers in our armed forces.

Supervisor Rodefer's life is marked by public service. From his 23 years of service with the United States Air Force to his eight years as County Supervisor, Karl has served the public with dedication and selflessness.

In addition to his service on a multitude of committees and commissions, Supervisor Rodefer has worked tirelessly to protect Tuolumne County's water resources, played an integral part in planning and future development of the Columbia Airport, was instrumental in acquiring grant funds to build the J.H. Dambacher Detention Center, spearheaded the County's Fire Safety and Community Resilience Initiative in 2019, and advocated for services for Veterans.

Karl Rodefer has been a sterling example of all that ought to be meant by the designation "public servant." I am proud today to congratulate Karl on his numerous accomplishments and to thank him for nearly a quarter century of commitment, dedication and service to the citizens of the United States and the residents of Tuolumne County.

#### RECOGNIZING DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS CHAPTER 17

##### HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize hard work and dedication of the local Disabled American Veterans Chapter in my district. The national organization was founded by veterans on September 25, 1920 and was officially chartered in 1932.

Our local chapter was established in 1971, primarily from veterans of World War II and Korea. Once facing dissolution, the DAV Chapter 17 bounced back and is now stronger than ever. This would not have been possible without the leadership of George Lindsey Jr., Don Parzanese, Bob Staranowicz, Jack Thomas, Tom Herron, Bill Severns, Lou Rizzo, and Kimberly Carter-Guerian. The Chapter works to support our veterans and the larger community through yearly events including job fairs, veteran ceremonies, and fundraisers. While Disabled American Veterans celebrates 100 years of serving veterans of the Armed Forces, their families, and survivors, we are extremely thankful for their commitment to helping veterans in need.

The DAV is dedicated to a single purpose: empowering veterans to lead high-quality lives with respect and dignity, their families, and survivors. Let us never forget the selfless sacrifice and dedication of all our disabled veterans across the country. In order to ensure that their memory is not forgotten, I include in the RECORD the names of all the current members of the DAV Chapter 17:

James F. Gartland, Robert A. Godwin, Leslie H. Goldstein, Edward T. Grabert, John P. Greer, Morris S. Guggenheim, James M. Haitsch, Charles G. Hall, Brain J. Hamilton,

Angela M. Hardy, Ronald J. Harkins, Thomas D. Herron, Daniel C. Haskett, Albert M. Hill, Timothy M. Holland, George K. Honer, Robert P. Hoopes, George W. Horne, George A. Ingram, Robert P. Joyce.

Gilbert Kasirsky, David C. Kline, Michael Krajnikovich, Daniel J. Kwiatkowski, Robert G. Larrisey, Joel Laskey, William Lee, Albert Paiste, Phillip Paoletta, Dennis Parker, Donald D. Parzanese, Noel G. Pelletier, Randy G. Phillips, Normand A. Picard, Francis X. Poole, Charles E. Quaste, William B. Redington, Edward D. Renner, Devon A. Richio, Lou Rizzo.

Brain M. Roberts, Larry F. Rodrigo, Edward A. Rosen, Ronald R. Rottloff, Amanda L. Rudolph, Joseph S. Runewicz, Alexander Rupeiks, John Schaefer, Bruce A. Sheeler, Richard W. Scholl, Lawrence M. Schorr, Robert J. Schulberger, Richard G. Scott, William J. Severns, Michael J. Shamp, Sharon Lynn Shaw, Otis L. Weathersby, William J. Wheeler, George K. Wiley.

Ian A. Woods, Todd E. Yanik, Douglas G. Yedinak, Ronald C. Zinzer, Fred Ewald, Gerry Albertson, Ronald Henry Alfors, Anthony Antonio, John W. Bader, Michael W. Barnes, Russell H. Bendel, James Howard Bergeson, Chuck Daniel Biresch, John A. Boccadori, Lawrence P. Booth, Martin M. Bradley, Mark Otis Bristow, David Bryk, Francis X. Buschman, Steve Calderbank, Paul J. Carsello, Kimberly Ann Carter, Sean W. Carty.

Demetrius R. Casillas, Fergus G. Castree, Thomas H. Chapin, Peter Chong, Theresa Colbert, Vincent A. Concordia, Mihael Wayne Corona, Stephen Cosminski, Francesco Cozza, John C. Craig, Richard E. Dalton, Herbert A. Dashiell, Thomas C. Day, Hugh F. Deithorn, James J. DelVecchio, Matthew P. Devlin, Anthony Dibilasio, Gary Lyn Dimaio, John L. D'Onofrio, Lawrence Duchnowski.

Darryl J. Dukowski, Alan G. Eck, Marcos Perez Elizondo, Orlando G. Epifano, Robert Errickson, Vincent Evangelista, Nelson Lewis Fairman, Joseph A. Farrugio, Joseph L. Felter, John P. Fernandez, Roy G. Ferrari, Robert J. Foley, Charles H. Fratz, Raymond A. Freiling, Henry Fretz, Lawrence A. Fulmer, Arthur T. Short, Hampton G. Silcox, Alfred E. Smith, Thomas J. Smith.

Robert I. Snovel, Edward L. Snyder, Stanley W. Stanwick, Robert Staranowicz, Martin Stern, Michael Ray Stever, Roy Stoker, Godfrey R. Strecker, Francis Tacey, Rudolph V. Taurino, Cindy Riley Ternay, John W. Thomas, David A. Thompson, Irvin P. Thompson, Joseph Troxell, Joseph M. Tyson.

Peter Paul Ulmen, Goline D. Vanderhoof, Atty T. VanHamel, Ronald F. Vellner, Donald T. Walton, Donald E. Libby, George Henry Lindsey, Hugh C. Liverman, Thomas A. Locke, William B. Luckenbill, Joseph T. Mallamaci, Anthony Lee Maniscola, F. Marciano-Rodriguez, John M. Marino, Anthony Thomas Mark, Gregory L. Marston.

Bruce B. Martin, Richard Matyskiela, Jean W. McGinnis, James Douglas McEwan, Richard P. McEwen, Richard Joseph McMullin, John Patrick Mowry, Daniel Moyer, Michael John Mullen, Ralph G. Myers, Norman B. Newbon, John J. O'Donnell, Jeffery T. Olavarria, Bruce Gary Onraet, Albert Ortiz, Donald S. Page, Robert T. Painter.

#### BIG CAT PUBLIC SAFETY ACT

SPEECH OF

##### HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 3, 2020*

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as an original sponsor and a senior Member of the

House of Representatives, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan bill, H.R. 1380, the "Big Cat Public Safety Act", which ends the ownership of dangerous big cats as pets as well as prohibits exhibitors from allowing public contact with cubs.

First and foremost, I would like to thank Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY for his leadership on this legislation.

Across the country, thousands of big cats like tigers, lions, leopards, and pumas are kept in miserable, insecure, and unsafe conditions by irresponsible owners.

These animals often come from a vicious cycle of breeding perpetuated by unscrupulous facilities looking to make a profit off of "cub petting" or photo opportunities.

It is an issue that causes immeasurable animal suffering and introduces inexcusable threats to human safety.

Big cats are wild animals and undoubtedly suffer when kept as pets.

They are often purchased as babies, and private owners are typically unable to manage them once they are fully grown.

As a result, the animals are frequently left to languish in grossly inadequate conditions, often being deprived of sufficient space, adequate veterinary care, a nutritious diet, and enrichment.

Furthermore, it is common procedure for some roadside zoos to inhumanely separate babies from their mothers, so that they can charge the public to pet and play with the cubs.

This is a cruel and unhealthy practice that can cause not only lifelong psychological problems but also premature death for the cubs.

These young cats quickly outgrow their usefulness in the cub handling industry and most often end up being sent to substandard "zoos," sold into the exotic pet trade, or possibly even killed and sold for parts.

This vicious cycle of exploitation and constant breeding must be stopped.

Currently, state laws regarding private ownership of big cats are inconsistent, and some states have few or no laws regarding the keeping of big cats.

Madam Speaker, a uniform federal law is necessary to end this dangerous industry once and for all.

The "Big Cat Public Safety Act" is a simple and straightforward solution to the devastating and growing crisis of negligent big cat breeding and ownership.

According to Big Cat Rescue, there have been more than 700 dangerous incidents in the U.S. involving big cats since 1990.

These incidents include hundreds of human injuries, maulings, and deaths.

In many of these cases, the animals were shot and killed, often by first responders who are not equipped to deal with these situations, thereby also putting them in harm's way.

Madam Speaker, throughout my tenure in Congress, I have been a staunch advocate for protecting endangered species, and this bill does that and much more.

For the safety of our first responders, of our community, and for these majestic animals, we need this vital piece of legislation.

I am honored to be a leader on this issue and on this bill, and so I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting for H.R. 1380, the "Big Cat Safety Act."

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE  
AND LEGACY OF SCOTT DAVIDSON

**HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, with feelings of sorrow, reverence, and immense gratitude, I rise today to honor the memory of Scott Davidson, who passed away last week after his battle with the coronavirus. As a proud member of the Kansas City Fire Department, Scott spent over a third of his life serving and protecting the people of Kansas City, Missouri.

Scott started his career with the Kansas City Fire Department in 2002 as a communication specialist with the Municipal Ambulance Services Trust, which provided emergency medical services to the Kansas City area. As a communication specialist, Scott served as the calming voice on the other side of the phone tasked with reassuring distressed families that help was on the way. Scott's calm demeanor and steady hand provided much needed hope in moments of darkness. Indeed, Scott helped ease worried minds, but more importantly, he played a vital role in saving countless lives throughout the city we call home. In 2010, Scott became a paramedic for the Department, joining a team that served as the first response to desperate cries for help. Each individual who, in a moment of crisis, called on Scott for help will forever remember and appreciate his heroic, lifesaving efforts as he sprang into action at a moment's notice. For Scott, as with countless paramedics across the country, saving lives and offering hope was the inspiration that prompted him to raise his hand and volunteer to risk his life for his community. In the days leading up to his untimely death, he was still on the frontlines, dispatching first responders to help those stricken by the same deadly virus that would eventually claim his own life.

More than anything, Scott was a man of faith who was a joy to all those who met him. Described by those who worked with him as having a personality and heart that was larger than life, Scott and his wife, Robin, treated the firefighters at Station 33 as if they were members of their own family. Together they celebrated the birth of every child in their fire station family, provided baked goods and treats to those working at the station during the holidays, and mourned with the families of other first responders who gave their lives in the line of duty.

Jackson County, Missouri has seen 175 neighbors, friends, and family members die from this virus. Scott, Captain Robert Rocha, and EMT Billy Birmingham are the first three of Kansas City's finest first responders who have succumbed to Coronavirus while helping save others. Scott dedicated over a third of his life to serving Kansas City and its people. My fervent hope is that Scott's death will serve as a reminder that we must stand together in the face of the adversity that plagues us. Wearing a protective mask, social distancing, and getting tested not only protects you from getting sick; it also ensures that first responders like Scott can go home to their families at the end of the day without worrying whether they or their loved ones will get sick. In times of unforeseen tragedy, I am comforted by the

teachings of Isaiah the prophet: When the righteous man perishes, he is taken away from calamity and enters into peace. A loving father, a dutiful public servant, and a beloved community member, Scott has rightfully earned the eternal peace that is awarded to the righteous man.

The thoughts of the Kansas City community and the Fifth Congressional District are with Robin and their three children, Scott's extended family, and the innumerable Kansas City Fire Department employees who were fortunate enough to work with him. Our community is mourning the untimely death of a young father, but we are also celebrating a life dedicated to serving and saving others. Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring Scott's legacy and offering our deepest condolences to his family. I also ask that you, other members of the House of Representatives, and the American people remember Scott and his family's sacrifice as we continue to combat the Coronavirus pandemic.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. GUY RESCIENTHALER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I was absent from the House on December 3, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted nay on Roll Call No. 230, nay on Roll Call No. 231, and yea on Roll Call No. 232.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. VIRGINIA FOXX**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, due to a test indicating a positive result for a COVID-19 infection during the most recent district work period, I was unable to travel to the Capitol to vote on December 3, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 230; NAY on Roll Call No. 231; and NAY on Roll Call No. 232.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I unfortunately failed to register my vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 1380, the Big Cat Public Safety Act.

While casting a proxy vote for my colleague, I unintentionally overlooked casting my own vote purely by oversight. As a cosponsor of the bill and having just cast a proxy vote for the bill clearly I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 232.

CONGRATULATING AARON W.  
SUTHERLAND

**HON. JOE CUNNINGHAM**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the election of Aaron W. Sutherland to the Newport Board of Education in Newport, Kentucky.

Aaron is a proud son of Carrollton, Kentucky where he set out at an early age to serve his community. Aaron was active in student government at every level of his academic career and he has always been devoted to helping others. In fact, I met Aaron while we were both serving on the Student Bar Association of the Salmon P. Chase College of Law. Aaron believed that service to his colleagues required action to advance their causes. His inquisitive and civic-minded attitude is infectious, and those who know him know that he has their best interest at heart.

Aaron is a proud attorney, and devotes himself to helping his clients. In addition to practicing law, he is also a civil servant. His time dedicated to both the United States Department of Labor and the United States Social Security Administration demonstrates his passion for serving others.

Aaron also believes in public education. This year, Aaron set out to serve the children and teachers of Newport, Kentucky. He was elected on a platform of putting the students first, and that is exactly what he will do as a member of that body. Aaron believes that everyone deserves a high-quality education and he will work to make sure that all students have the opportunity to succeed.

The people of Newport are lucky to have Aaron serving on their Board of Education, and I am lucky to call him my friend.

RECOGNIZING SUPERVISOR JOHN  
GRAY

**HON. TOM McCLINTOCK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize John Gray for his devoted service as a Tuolumne County Supervisor.

Supervisor Gray was first elected to serve the 4th District of Tuolumne County in 2008 and has represented the people of this county and his district with passion, commitment and integrity ever since.

Supervisor Gray is well known for his many accomplishments and contributions to the community, including his leadership during an economic recession in 2008, acquiring grant funds to construct two Community Resilience Centers as well as two new Detention Facilities, and his consistent participation in fuels reduction and fire protection work. John has also been an instrumental leader for a special tax in support of Tuolumne County Ambulance in Groveland and implementing requirements of the Health Care and Public Safety realignments.

In his 12 years of service, John Gray will be remembered by the partnerships he built, his commitment to be a good steward of taxpayer

dollars and his constant focus on improving the lives of every resident of Tuolumne County.

Supervisor John Gray has truly been an asset to Tuolumne County in making it a more prosperous place for small businesses and a more desirable community for residents and visitors. It is my privilege to rise today in recognition of his distinguished public service.

RECOGNIZING MAJOR BRETT  
KUHR

**HON. JACK BERGMAN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the tremendous work of Major Brett Kuhrt during his time as my office's legislative fellow. Major Kuhrt's leadership, work ethic, and commitment to public service have made him an integral part of our team.

In a year of unprecedented challenges, Brett has helped countless constituents in Michigan's First District with everything from navigating federal agencies to answering in-depth policy questions. He has shown a keen ability to tackle complex issues ranging from national security and defense to veterans and labor policy, crafting legislative policy and providing technical support to staff. Brett has also displayed a true willingness to serve in multiple capacities, always lending a hand when needed, no questions asked. He has set a high standard for future fellows and is an outstanding example of the best of the U.S. Air Force.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of myself and my staff, I thank Major Kuhrt for his exceptional work on behalf of Michigan's First Congressional District, and I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE  
AND MEMORY OF CAPTAIN ROBERT  
"BOBBY" ROCHA

**HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy and tired heart to honor the life of fire Captain Robert Joseph "Bobby" Rocha. Captain Rocha was a beloved, giving, vibrant soul, who lost his life last week after battling a COVID-19 infection he caught in the line of duty. Captain Rocha gave twenty-nine years of honorable service to the Kansas City Fire Department, and while his life was cut short, we must ensure that his memory is never forgotten.

Captain Rocha began at the fire department back in 1991, the same year I was sworn in as Mayor of Kansas City. Since then, I have watched from afar as he rose to the rank of Captain while earning the respect and admiration of his fellow firefighters and the city he protected. When the coronavirus hit, Captain Rocha knew the fire department was in for a long haul. During this past year, firefighters around the country have been assisting EMTs

more and more with pandemic-related emergency calls. In Kansas City, more than 200 members of the fire department have tested positive and seventy-three are currently infected. Captain Rocha likely came into contact with ten to fifteen COVID-19 each and every day while in uniform.

And then, the worst happened. In early November, Captain Rocha went into quarantine and was eventually hospitalized. He fought the disease valiantly, with the same vigor and verve with which he fought fires and saved lives for nearly three decades. But as Captain Rocha no doubt taught the young firefighters he trained, not all battles can be won; and on November 21st, Captain Rocha made his way toward eternal peace. He was sixty years old.

Captain Rocha will be remembered in the community as a courageous public servant and a generous leader. We will never forget his selflessness, his humility, or the twenty-nine years he dedicated to our safety and peace of mind. His team will remember him as a mentor who trained and prepared them for the risks that they faced every day on the job. His family and friends remember him as loving man with a good sense of humor and an incredible ability to inspire those around him. They remember Captain Rocha as a man who would do anything for anybody. They say people looked up to him "like he was Hercules." And throughout his life, Captain Rocha always proved to be a decent, dependable man—a man who loved to ride his motorcycle, sing karaoke, and spend time with friends at the Outpost Bar and Grill.

"For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many," scripture tells us. This has been a year of loss, a year of painful goodbyes, and a year of empty seats at the dinner table. But it also a year of heroes. The doctors, nurses, medical students, nursing students, EMTs, firefighters, and ordinary Americans who have placed their health in the hands of God to save others. Heroes who have come to serve the wellbeing of complete strangers. And, all too often, heroes who have given their lives as ransom for untold millions. Heroes like Captain Rocha.

Today, my prayers are with Captain's Rocha's family, his friends, and all his brothers and sisters at Station 18. Let it be preserved in this timeless Record that his loss leaves us with a grief that cannot be weighed and debt that cannot be paid. His legacy lives on in the countless lives he touched and saved. So, Madam Speaker, let us honor Captain Rocha. Let us remember the light he brought with him everywhere he went. And, whatever we do in Congress today, tomorrow, next week, next year let the story of Captain Rocha sit at my chair in this Chamber. Let the stories of his fallen brothers, Billy Birmingham and Scott Davidson, walk with me through these halls. Let those stories remind us all that we have a part to play. Let them remind us of our duty to serve.

In the coming days, flags across my state will fly at half-staff to honor Captain Rocha, dutiful Americans will wear masks and adhere to social distancing, and first responders will wake up again and again to walk into a weary nightmare that we have the power to make less dark. Captain Rocha gave his life to save others. We can never repay that debt. But it is our duty to try.

MARTHA GRACE FIELDS, CONGRESSIONAL AWARD SILVER MEDALIST

**HON. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding work of Martha Grace Fields. Martha is an exceptional young woman who was recently announced as a Silver Medalist for the Congressional Award, one of the highest honors presented to America's youth. The Congressional Award Foundation was created to recognize initiative, service, and achievement in young people. Martha has demonstrated the core components of this award through her servant heart and unmatched work ethic. She gave back to her local community by completing over two-hundred hours of public service. Beyond her service to others, she put in hundreds of hours of personal development by competing on her high school swim team and enrolling in numerous leadership courses and seminars. Additionally, Martha was one of the first females to receive the highest honor in Boy Scouts, the rank of Eagle Scout. Simultaneously, she received the highest rank in the Sea Scouts, Quartermaster. Martha's continued hard work has not gone unnoticed, and I am proud to see her receive the recognition she deserves. I would like to congratulate Martha for her impressive achievements at such a young age and I look forward to seeing her continued success and leadership.

HONORING PRESIDENT JERRY  
RAWLINGS OF GHANA

**HON. BARBARA LEE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, today we honor the extraordinary life and career of Jerry Rawlings, the former President of Ghana.

He was born on June 22, 1947 in Accra, Ghana to his loving mother Victoria Agbotuni. He received his education from the Achimota Secondary School, graduating in 1966 with his general education certification. While in school he became well known for his love of Polo and his willingness to speak out about injustice.

In 1967 he enlisted in the Ghanaian Air Force and became a flight cadet. Shortly afterward, he was selected to attend the Ghana Military Academy and Training School. Upon completing his training in 1969 he was awarded the "Speed Bird Trophy" acknowledging his top ranking status in flying and airmanship. Nine years later he earned the rank Flight-Lieutenant.

During his career in the military, he began to observe how corruption, privilege, and injustice impact soldiers and the people they are sworn to protect.

His concerns about Ghana's future led him to become an outspoken critic of the corruption and mismanagement he saw from the country's military leaders and called for more attention to the plight of Ghana's poor.

Eventually, he led an effort to remove the existing military government and convened elections. When the subsequent government encountered challenges managing the economy, he intervened again, and ruled directly for the next eleven years. During his time as unelected leader, President Rawlings sought to introduce reforms that would place Ghana on a firm economic foundation and create shared prosperity.

In 1992, President Rawlings convened elections and presided over a gradual return to democracy and openness in Ghana. After two terms as elected leader, President Rawlings retired in 2001 and presided over the peaceful transfer of power to the opposition leader John Kufuor.

Following his presidency, he continued to be active in world affairs, particularly as the African Union special envoy to Somalia.

President Rawlings' commitment to justice and opportunity extended beyond Ghana and the African continent to African Americans and the African diaspora. In particular, President Rawlings worked actively, both in office and in retirement, to build bridges between Ghana and African Americans. In 2019, Members of the Congressional Black Caucus traveled to Ghana to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the beginning of the brutal institution of slavery in America. On that occasion, Members of the Congressional Black Caucus met with President Rawlings and his family, and he pledged to continue his effort to deepen bonds between Ghana and the African American community.

We offer sincerest condolences to his wife, his children, and the Ghanaian people. The United States Congress stands in solidarity with the people of Ghana as they commemorate President Rawlings' legacy, and continue their work to strengthen democratic institutions and inclusive prosperity in their country.

#### COMMEMORATING MS. KATHERINA DIMENSTEIN'S DEPARTURE

#### HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate my Chief of Staff, Ms. Katherina Dimenstein as she departs from my office. Katherina has devoted the past eight years of her life and career to the people of Arizona.

I want to thank Katherina for her dedication and service to Arizona's 6th District. She did an outstanding job for our office, especially her excellent work to promote strong trade relationships for Arizona and help modernize our tax code through the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. She is committed to being both a voice and a resource for the people.

Congress is an institution devoted to serving the people, and Katherina has exemplified this every day by not only meeting with Arizonans, veterans, and advocacy groups, but by managing all my Washington, D.C. office operations and legislative priorities on the Ways and Means Committee. We look to Katherina as an incredibly valued member of our team, and we will greatly miss her.

#### FAREWELL REMARKS EXPRESSING GRATITUDE FOR THE HONOR OF REPRESENTING MISSOURI'S FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

#### HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my farewell remarks as a Member of the U.S. House.

And while I will be sad to leave this historic place, I will forever be grateful for the opportunity to serve Missouri's 1st Congressional District for two decades, and to have been blessed with the friendship of so many colleagues.

I have given my best because my constituents deserved nothing less. I learned that vital lesson about public service from my best advisor and my personal hero . . . my dad, former Congressman Bill Clay.

And the truth is none of my success would have been possible without my remarkable family.

I want to thank the rock of our family, my mother Carol; and my devoted and talented sisters, Vickie and Michelle.

I also want to thank my children, Carol and Will. No Member serves unto themselves. Families also sacrifice greatly. Carol and Will have made me extremely proud. They carry themselves with such dignity, poise, and character. There is no greater joy I have than being their Father. I thank them for being my greatest and best legacy.

To my wonderful wife Pat: I could not have selected a better partner to share in my post-Congressional career. Her love and optimism keep my life balanced and exhilarated. I so look forward to our days to come.

Of course, the best part of being a Member of Congress has been helping tens of thousands of constituents solve issues with the federal government.

None of that could have been possible without my dedicated and compassionate staff over the years—Patricia Green, Sheila Mileszko, Virginia Cook, Debra Miller, Michelle Bogdanovich, Sandra Houston, Ishmael-Lateef Ahmad, Jasmina Hadzic, Sean Weller, Craig Rasmussen, Percy Green, Adam Bordes, Marvin Steele, Richard Pecante, Frank "Les" Davis, Mark Odom, Lou Aboussie, Noelle Lindsey, Brian Williams, Michelle Mitchell, Britany Packnett, Josh Peters, Pauline Jamry, Perre Smalls, Samantha Williams, Sherry Faulkner, Tony Grandison, Bill Sibert, Frank Taylor, Erica Powell, Matt Alexis, Rico Doss, and my Communications Director Steven Engelhardt, and the late Allison Singfield and the late Dottie Ross.

I would like to extend a special thanks to educator Gwendolyn Reed, who also served as a staffer for both me and my father, Congressman Bill Clay, Sr.

I also want to thank an exceptional American who has devoted 48 years of public service to the U.S. House, my remarkable Constituent Services Director, Edwillia Massey.

I want to thank my devoted Executive Assistant and Scheduler, Karyn Long. Karyn is

family. She always went above and beyond for me and I am forever grateful.

I also want to especially thank all my Chiefs of Staff: Harriet Grigsby, Darryl Piggee and Yvette Cravins.

In the book of Matthew chapter 25, verses 36–40, the scriptures read, "When I was naked you clothed me. I was sick you visited me, when I was in prison you came to me. The righteous answered, Lord, when did we see you hungry, thirsty, clothed you, or in prison visited?" And the King answered them, "Truly, I say to you, as you did it to the least of these my brothers, you did it to me."

These scriptures have been a guidepost for my career in public service. Over my ten terms, I have fearlessly advocated for the permanent interests of African Americans and other unheard voices.

I have had many legislative achievements in this body and I thank all of colleagues who assisted me in doing as the scriptures noted "caring for the least of these". In my remaining time, I would like to highlight a few victories.

For 14 years, I hosted the Career Fair at St. Louis' HBCU, Harris-Stowe State University, which connected thousands of job seekers with good paying jobs providing economic stability.

Creating jobs and economic development was a priority for me. We were able to build the new \$120 million National Archives Administration Center in North St. Louis County.

The greatest economic victory for North St. Louis was the bipartisan effort to build the headquarters of the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency. That \$1.7 billion project is the largest single federal investment in St. Louis history, of which I am extremely proud.

As Chair of the Financial Services Housing Subcommittee, I secured the renovation of over 200 units of housing at the old Homer G. Phillips hospital in North St. Louis and an additional 200 plus units in Wellston with the help of St. Louis County.

People in my district, particularly the elderly, deserve to live with dignity and security.

As Chair of the Oversight Census Subcommittee, I worked to ensure Census 2010 was successful and addressed the digital divide in vulnerable communities.

My focus on healthcare led to The Everson Walls and Ron Springs Gift of Life legislation, increasing grants to states and expanded organ and tissue registry for minorities.

I have been a champion for environmental justice, cleaning up waste sites often lingering in minority neighborhoods.

My environmental record includes \$5 million to clean up the former St. Louis Army Ammunition plant; \$30 million to clean up the former Carter Carburetor plant; and \$266 million to clean up West Lake Landfill which holds waste from the Manhattan Project.

Lastly, one of my signature achievements was the African-American Civil Rights Network Act. The National Park's program educates generations on the struggles of African Americans who demanded full civil rights in spite of violence and hate.

I am proud of my legacy and work for Missouri's first Congressional District.

May God bless you all, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.



## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I was not present for the following roll call votes. Had I been present for them, I would have voted as follows: Roll Call No. 230: H. Res. 1244 Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3884) Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act—ORDERING THE PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 1244—NAY, and Roll Call No. 232: H.R. 1380 Big Cat Public Safety Act—ON MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS—NAY.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE  
OF TOM CASPERSON**HON. JACK BERGMAN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the life of Tom Casperson, who passed away recently after a lifetime of service to his fellow Michiganders. Through his extreme dedication to public service, Tom became an indispensable part of the Upper Peninsula and the entire state of Michigan.

Tom was born on January 20, 1959. A native Yooper, Tom was born in Escanaba and graduated from Escanaba High School in 1977. Prior to being elected to the state legislature, Tom worked for 27 years in his family's log trucking business, including 12 years as its owner and operator. However, a 1998 logging truck accident sparked a drive in Tom for larger public service. He would go on to be elected to the Michigan House of Representatives in 2002. In his six years in the Michigan House and eight years in the Senate, Tom

was a strong and universally respected voice for the U.P.—confronting challenging issues head-on and working across the aisle for the benefit of his constituents. He authored many pieces of legislation that became law, and his unwavering commitment to his ideals and the people of Michigan were unquestionable.

Tom passed away on November 29, 2020. He is missed dearly by his family and friends, and his legacy will undoubtedly live on for generations to come. Tom's tireless devotion to the public good touched the lives of countless Michiganders, and the impact of his work cannot be overstated.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of Michigan's First Congressional District, I ask you to join me in honoring the life of Tom Casperson. His legacy will forever live on in his family and through the many lives he bettered through his service.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. JOHN A. YARMUTH**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I unfortunately was unable to be present for a vote taken on the House floor on December 3, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: Roll Call Vote No. 232: YEA.

RECOGNIZING SUPERVISOR  
SHERRI BRENNAN**HON. TOM MCCLINTOCK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, December 4, 2020*

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Sherri Brennan for her devoted service as a Tuolumne County Supervisor.

Supervisor Brennan was first elected to serve the 1st District of Tuolumne County in 2010 where she served a total of two terms as County Supervisor.

From her long family history of agriculture to her passion for serving children and seniors, Sherri's eight years as a Supervisor have been marked by her dedication to all the people of Tuolumne County.

In addition to her participation on various committees and commissions, Supervisor Brennan received the Excellence in Government Award from the Tuolumne County Chamber of Commerce in 2019. She also was named Woman of the Year in the 5th District in 2015 by Assembly Member Bigelow for her outstanding service and dedication to the people of California. In 2018, she was honored by the Center for a Non-Violent Community for International Women's Day.

Supervisor Brennan has worked tirelessly on behalf of her district and the entirety of Tuolumne County. She has advocated locally and nationally for full funding of Payment in Lieu of Taxes, the Secure Rural Schools Program, Public Lands and Forest Health projects, including Rim Fire Recovery and the County's Master Stewardship Agreement with the Forest Service. Sherri's advocacy for and commitment to Tuolumne County has been an asset to every resident.

In her years as a Supervisor, Sherri Brennan has been a leader and a visionary. She has served the residents of her district, and the entire County, with steadfast commitment and perseverance.